THE WORLD IS BROKEN: EXPANDING FRAME-ALIGNMENT THEORY WITH CAMPUS MINISTRIES

BY

MATTHEW PEACH

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2019

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Anna-Maria Marshall, Chair
Associate Professor Rebecca Sandefur
Associate Professor Brian Dill
Assistant Professor Ghassan Moussawi

Abstract

Employing an extended case method ethnography combined with in-depth interviews and content analysis, this project approaches two university-level chapters of campus ministries, Cru and InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, as social movement organizations (SMOs) representing the US evangelical movement. While they do not practice political lobbying or activism, both work for social change through evangelism and spiritual/moral instruction of their membership. Rather than an injustice frame with temporal villains to overcome, their collective action frame has members contending with flaws in the world itself, and themselves. As with the broader evangelical movement, the range of issues that campus ministries are concerned with is almost unlimited. No issue is beyond them, and no concern beneath them. Balancing resources between many potential foci, and weighing controversial stances on public issues (e.g. LGBT rights) against the desire to attract and welcome everyone, present significant challenges to campus ministries.

Frame alignment theory explains the formation and activities of SMOs in terms of the account they offer of the world, and the part that potential members can play in it. Recently, critics have called upon frame alignment theorists to overcome their bias towards the elites of social movements, rather than treating frames as static products created by leaders that members act on unquestioningly. This project seeks to answer that call by focusing on the understandings and experiences of ground-level members in addition to those of the leadership, and expands the body of frame alignment theory by adding the concepts of frame smoothing tactics, which are used to justify and explain changes in an SMO's framing, and frame detailing, wherein the organization's framing is clarified and emphasized not by expanding it into a detailed, involved account. These concepts offer theoretical tools for describing not just how SMOs gather and motivate adherents, but also how those adherents can be convinced to take the correct actions (by the SMO's standards), and how their investment can be maintained through both changes and doldrums.

To my parents, who found each other at a meeting much like these.

Acknowledgements

I will start by thanking the members of my doctoral committee, particularly the chair, Dr. Anna Marshal, who patiently guided me from the very earliest, roughest drafts to chapters that we could share with the rest of the committee, and then, finally, to this manuscript. Each member of the committee did far more than just facilitating the process; if I were to list all the ways that Dr. Rebecca Sandefur, Dr. Brian Dill, and Dr. Ghassan Moussawi introduced me to new tools and theories, guided me in improving my writing, and offered invaluable advice and encouragement, this acknowledgment section would turn into an eighth chapter.

Additionally, I extend gratitude to Dr. Jonathan Ebel, who got me off to a running start in the historical research that contributed to this project.

I will also take this opportunity to thank Dr. Jeanne Lorentzen, who convinced me that grad school was a thing I could do. It turns out that she was right!

Finally, I thank my friends and colleagues here at UIUC, particularly Valeria Bonatti, Parthiban Muniandy, Cameron and Katie Riopelle, Julie Krueger, and Matt Schneider, among others. Whether it was by discussing our research, connecting me with resources, or just keeping me company via the web while deadlines loom, I couldn't have done it without them.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 – Introduction: A Movement of Ministries

"Imagine a campus where everybody knows someone who knows Christ," the speaker said at Cru's first large group meeting in the Fall of 2016. "Imagine how different the world would be." As the semester wore on, it became clear that "knowing Christ" was not a casual proposition in the view of Cru or InterVarsity, and that they projected such a world would look very different from the one we inhabit. In the framing of evangelical campus ministries, spreading the gospel (the good news that Jesus died on the cross to save humanity from its sin) is more than a way to spread their sect and raise their prestige; it is a path to changing the world, and the lives of everyone their ministry touches.

While they style themselves as part of a movement, it is easy to dismiss campus ministries such as Cru and InterVarsity Christian Fellowship as mere student clubs. They boast thousands of members nationwide, but do not make a splash on the campuses where they gather. They don't march or protest or boycott, though some chapters engage in service work, and they approach new potential members in a mild, unimposing fashion. Even for members, their commitment to the ministry can easily be limited to an hour's meeting every week, if that. So, is there anything to the claim that they are a movement? And, if we treat them as members of a movement, can we social scientists learn anything about social movements from them? This dissertation is based on an ethnographic study into the local chapters of two campus ministry organizations in a midwestern public university. In the study I have found much that may be particular to campus ministries, but also some strategies and concepts that could apply to other social movement types.

As the specific research questions refer to specific concepts within frame alignment theory, I will describe them in more detail after the literature review below. After the research questions, this chapter will feature a brief introduction to the research sites, and an outline of the chapters of this dissertation, which will include chapters on methodology and historical background.

Literature Review

This will be a brief overview of research that bears on this dissertation, falling into four broad categories: evangelicalism as a social movement, frame alignment theory, emotions and social movements, and collective identity formation, particularly as it relates to evangelical Christianity.

Campus Ministries as Social Movement Organizations

The first question that this review must address is whether it makes sense to apply theories designed for social movement organizations to campus ministries, and, conversely, whether such theories can be expanded meaningfully by a study of campus ministries. Chapter 3 will cover the history of the ministries and a quick overview of the broader social movement that they fit into: evangelicalism. Through evangelicalism, Cru and IVCF are at least adjacent to SMOs with enormous political influence. However, as chapter 4 will reveal, the goals and methods of the ministries in this study are directed almost entirely towards members and potential religious converts, while their rhetoric strives to remain apolitical. Can they be considered social movement organizations from a theoretical perspective?

Recently, social movement studies have started making more room for social movements that have focus their efforts on institutions other than the state (Van Dyke et al 2005), including corporations (Bartley & Child 2014) and the medical establishment (Chiarello 2018), and educational institutions (Van Dyke 2003), among others, so the fact that neither ministry is directly challenging the government. Religious movements in particular can pursue a range of "non-obtrusive" tactics for influencing institutions, among them "burrowing into" secular institutions by having members work to gain formal leadership positions within those institutions, or

"assimilating into" them by crafting an identity or set of practices that can accommodate both the dominant culture and the religious elements they are trying to introduce; both sets of tactics are very different from the types of contentious politics social movement studies usually cover, intended to work from outside of the dominant culture. (Kucinskas 2014) Even simple churches – particularly "missional" churches with a stated outward focus on serving their communities, rather than an inward focus on just their members – can be approached through social movement and social entrepreneurship theories. (Pitt 2016)

Campus ministries may look more like social clubs than organizations within a movement, but their goals are those of a movement. They operate by integrating themselves into the culture of the university and seeking to influence its culture through consensus rather than contention, driving to recruit both students and faculty. Members are given ethical and moral instruction and expected to spread it, and invite others in; the ministries make no direct demands of the government of the university, but seek to change them all the same. This study uses frame alignment theory to approach these processes of recruitment, instructing members, and presenting their designs for the world.

A Brief Introduction to Frame Alignment Theory

Frame alignment theory grew out of Goffman's concept of psychological frames, and addresses the cultural aspects of social movement activity and help to account for the motivations of individual participants, acknowledging their agency and that of the organizations they join. Apart from simply recognizing opportunities in their political environment or having access to varying levels of resources, what can SMOs do to attract support and attack opponents? What convinces individuals to support social movements and adopt their views? "Framing processes"

are one answer. Snow and Benford recognized that just as individuals have personal frames of their own– accounts that describe the world and their place in it in comprehensible terms – one of the tasks of social movement organizations is to create and present frames that can be used to modify the personal frames of individuals to bring them in line with the movement's and convince them to act on its behalf. This creates a rationalistic image of micromobilization (individuals taking part in social movements), where potential members are presented with alternative explanations for their own experiences, as well as events beyond their ken, and convinced to accede to them. However, as we will see below, there is room for emotion in it.

Framing is a process of creating meaning by interpreting world events and the experiences of potential supporters, connecting various elements of their experience of the world into a coherent narrative and focusing their attention in areas that are relevant to the social. The product of framing processes is a *collective action frame*, a shared narrative and orienting structure that can be used to attract, motivate and direct social movement supporters (Snow et al 1986, Snow 2004). Frames can also be oriented outward in an effort to make the social movement organization's understanding of the world more broadly accepted in society (Williams 2011). Frame alignment theory works to supplement existing social movement theories by adding an understanding of culture and subjectivity, recognizing the importance of the emotions and understandings of SMO supporters (and others) to its fortunes (Snow 2012).

While this definition might sound similar to ideology, I am holding the frames adopted by social movement organizations separate from their underlying ideology for the purposes of this analysis. Framing is often described as an ideological process, but they are different in that frames are consciously, deliberately crafted and modified by social movement actors for instrumental purposes. The process of framing can introduce people to new ideologies and help to trigger

changes in their ideological belief, but collective action frames as a product of framing processes should not be considered a substitute for all of the analytical purposes and definitions of ideology (Oliver & Johnston 2000).

Benford and Snow (1992, 2000) lay out two helpful sets of concepts for understanding how collective action frames are created and what gives them efficacy: core framing tasks and resonance. In short, the core framing tasks include the construction of a diagnostic frame, which identifies a problem and attributes responsibility/blame, a prognostic frame, which articulates a solution or measures to mitigate it, and a motivational frame, which provides a "call to arms" that convinces potential supporters that they are able to take part in that solution, and should. Organizations within the same movement can differ on these dimensions, attracting different sorts of members and attacking the same problems from different angles, such as anti-death penalty organizations that variously lobby for changes to the law or work to save individual convicts on death row.

However, a neatly constructed frame is useless if nobody is convinced by it. A frame also needs *resonance*, or congruence with the beliefs and experiences of potential supporters. It ought to be consistent with the existing narratives that potential supporters hold, credible according to their empirical experiences, and presented by people who they already find to be credible. Finally, for maximum effect, the frame should be directly relevant (or *salient*) to the recipients' lived experiences (Benford and Snow 2000). As noted above, even influencing people who never come to support the movement directly can be a victory, as it can make a society more amenable to the changes the SMO wants to make.

There are two crucial points to remember when considering resonance and salience. First, while empirical credibility is important, frames do not have to be objectively "correct" in order to

be accepted. If a person catches a cold soon after getting their flu shot, for instance, this could confirm the frame of the anti-vaccination movement in their experience regardless of the objective reality of what viruses are attacking their body.

Conversely, even if the social problem a social movement is identifying is pervasive in and easily observed, SMOs still have to engage in framing in order to convince people to mobilize and accept their solutions to the problem. The Civil Rights Movement, for instance, had to construct relevant frames to articulate the ills of racial segregation and discrimination, and mobilize supporters against them (Oliver & Johnston 2000, Williams 2002). While frames do not have to be true, they are also not necessarily fiction. In this study, I will be largely agnostic on the question of whether the frames it describes are accurate descriptions of reality except insofar as it influences their resonance and bears on the discursive practices (discussed below) around them.

Frames do not remain static once they are created; social movement actors subject them to frame alignment processes, strategies used to link the movement's interests and understandings with those of potential supporters and resource holders, and discursive practices, the communication that occurs between supporters in the context of movement activities (Snow and Benford 2000). Both frame alignment processes and discursive practices will be important to my analysis.

Frame alignment processes include frame bridging (attempts to connect a social movement's frame to a congruent but structurally unconnected sets of interests), frame amplification (focusing, strengthening, and clarifying the organization's frame), frame extension (demonstrating that the issues the movement is concerned with extend beyond their current constituency), and frame transformation (attempting to radically changing existing understandings and perspectives, and generate new ones) (Snow 2012). Discursive processes include frame

articulation, efforts to collect observations and experiences and stitch them together into a compelling narrative that is relevant to the SMO's interests, and frame amplification that occurs between members, rather than in official publications and broadcasts (Snow 2004).

There are other qualities that can influence the effectiveness of a social movement's frame beyond resonance, such as the degree of relevant supporting detail that it offers, its diagnostic scope (how broadly applicable the problems identified are, and how severe they are described as), and the sheer quantity of framing activities (Benford 1993, Cress and Snow 2000, McCammon 2009).

A more recent study by McEntire et al. (2011) suggests that some kinds of details can be more helpful than others. They used a typology crafted by McEntire that classified frames into informational (composed mainly of facts and figures), personal (human anecdotes that seek to stir emotions in potential supporters), and motivational (frames that emphasize the listener's ability to keep action) categories, and then compared the effects of frames of different types on recipients to take action against. In this case, they found that all three types were more effective for motivating solidarity rather than concrete action, but personal frames were the most effective of the three.

Little work has been done on frame alignment theory as it relates to evangelicalism and how Christian organizations approach the core framing tasks (diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing), and I was unable to find any that focused on campus ministries in particular. However, David Snow et al. (2017) brought framing theory to bear on evangelical megachurches, here defined as churches with a weekly attendance of 2000 members or more, which can give us a basis for comparison. This was a long-term participant observation study carried out by a whole team of researchers across several different megachurches, and found that such churches had become major players in the self-help market, and were employing prognostic and diagnostic

framing to craft Christian responses to an ever-broadening array of personal issues for members, a process that is largely carried out in small groups within the body of the church. While Snow et al.'s study focused on a workshop concerned with the "problem" of same-sex attraction, a subject the ministries here rarely touch on, chapter 3 will show that similar processes are at play for other issues.

The greatest similarity that we will see between the framing of the megachurches and the ministries is the strong focus on self-improvement and individual actions and perspectives that members can take, not (directly) for the benefit of the organization, but for their own benefit. However, this manner of interacting with churches and ministries is explicitly discouraged, and members have different ways of negotiating it.

This points to a common criticism of existing frame-alignment studies: their elite bias, wherein the collective action frame that is put before supporters is considered a finished product that they are assumed to accept and act on unquestioningly (Ryan 2005). One way to approach this criticism is by studying social movement organizations over a longer period of time, observing how it changes and evolves, which can create a series of distinct frames as the movement adapts to an ongoing dialog between actors (Lin & Zhao 2016). Another, not mutually exclusive with the first, is to focus on the frames that members on the ground are acting on, rather than the product that movement organizers put before them – in understanding the actions of social movement supporters, it may be more important to consider the meaning that they took from a frame, rather than the meaning that organizers were thinking of, or unaffiliated analysts might infer (Snow 2014, Vijay & Kulkarni 2015).

Social Movements and Emotions

Williams (2002) outlines two such criticisms of frame alignment theory as it is commonly used: one is that framing literature tends to have a cognitive bias, treating framing as a strategic challenge for organizers and ignoring the emotional and moral dimensions of framing activity. The other is that framing studies tend to shortchange the degree to which frames are constrained by existing, culturally legitimate boundaries – ironically, in order to effect social change, they must become acceptable enough to the existing status quo to attract broad support, and it is important to recognize how the frame of a social movement organization fits into the broader cultural context. Williams addresses both of these criticisms by approaching religion as a symbolic repertoire for the Christian Right and the Civil Rights Movement that combines the moral, affective, and cognitive dimensions of framing and resonates strongly with the existing cultural environment in the United States.

According to Jasper (2011), this cognitive bias has been a consistent problem with social movement research for decades, as an overcorrection from theories that treated collective action as inherently irrational. The dichotomy between emotion and rationality is a false one when it comes to social movements, and emotions serve many purposes in inspiring and guiding mobilization, including directing members' attention, disciplining them, building solidarity between members, and providing important feedback for the social movement's activities. Of particular interest in Jasper's explorations of emotions in social movements is his concept of the "moral battery," where action is motivated and sustained through the contrast of two contrasted emotions, like the positive and negative poles of a battery. The most-studied pair of emotions is pride and shame (for an example, see Britt & Heisse's 2000 account of the efforts of gay rights' activists to transmute shame into pride), but other contrasts could also motivate action.

The sociology of emotions also offers an insight in that people interpret the physical sensations of their emotions in ways that are bounded by their experiences and cultures. (Peterson 2006) This bridges cognition and emotion by pointing out that not only do emotions influence thought, but thought also influences emotion as well. This bears heavily on the ability of a social movement's framing to motivate action in response to a social problem or injustice – after all, the difference between righteous indignation and helpless humiliation can be as fine as the interpretation that a person leaps to when their heart races, and blood rushes to their face. This insight is particularly important to understanding campus ministries because one of their primary methods is instructing members in how to manage and relate to their mental and emotional lives.

Just as researchers examining social movements must carefully balance the weight that they give emotion in their analyses, social movement actors themselves have to carefully consider where and how to evoke and deploy emotions. Gamson (1995) presented this dilemma in straightforward terms, describing a balance between "cold cognitions" that treat injustice as systemic and not rooted in the agency of specific humans, and "hot cognitions," which focus on the human agents responsible for the injustice that the social movement seeks to address. Both carry risks – cold cognitions can result in an "over-determined structural analysis" that cannot motivate anyone to action, while hot cognitions can lead to social movement actors attributing system problems to individual human actors and focusing on destroying or thwarting them, rather than effectively addressing the injustice that drew the movement together. Gamson sees no easy way through this dilemma; in chapter 4's analysis, we will see the path that campus ministries chose.

Evangelicalism and Collective Identity

The creation and deployment of collective identities by social movement organizations is highly complex and involves negotiation among many layers of participation. One of the beats that Flesher-Fominaya hits in her 2010 review of identity formation literature as it relates to social movements is whether the identities associated with movements are to be considered products that are created for members to take on, or a process that members undergo and take part in shaping. The literature concerned with identity formation in Christian organizations reflects this tension by showing the machinations of leaders (both official and lay) to cultivate particular types of identities for members, and members doing the work of deciding what their participation means to them and how their faith should affect the world. Flesher-Fominaya saw that these two understandings of identity can coexist, and that they can have different types of interplay in different movements.

Words Upon the Word by James Bielo (2009) is an ethnography of bible study groups that finds that important parts of the religious identity of evangelical Christians are built in small groups like this; that rather than taking their marching orders and stomping out, many evangelicals proactively come together to build what it means to be a Christian in their lives. The groups Bielo studied had widely varying tones and focuses, but he was able to identify some trends in common. Many groups were focused on building open, warm, supportive relationships among members, as a bulwark against a hostile world. In most groups, doubting and questioning is not only tolerated, but encouraged. The groups all had different approaches to their religion, but were concerned with similar social issues and cultural others. It thus seems likely that the work of Cru and IVCF's framing and identity building are more complex than can be captured by analyzing online articles.

Another point Bielo raises is that biblical literalism for evangelicals seems to act as a mark of allegiance, rather than an actual hermeneutic, and most of the groups were either focused on the

individual applicability of its lessons, or on coming into contact with cultural others in a warm, accepting way and "witnessing" to them, much like the campus ministries this study examines. This way of reading and thinking about the bible has colonized evangelicals' reading of everyday experiences, as they are always searching to pinpoint the lessons of every action and event. For this reason, it seems likely that it is especially important the framing of campus ministries to have resonance with the individual experiences of its members, because if being a member is a part of their religious identity, they are surely watching for it.

Lydia Bean's findings in *The Politics of Evangelical Identity* (2014) reinforce this idea. The congruence between evangelical Christian faith and conservative politics was not dictated by a cadre of elite political operators, but built over time within congregations by lay leaders, congregants who openly state their political views at church functions; generally, those with misgivings do not speak up, and the general association between small-government conservatism and Christianity grows. While Christian Smith (1998) had found that evangelical Christians are more politically active than other brands of Christian, and Bean reported that the overwhelming conservative consensus among evangelicals, this does not often manifest as overt political protest and action; for instance, only 10% of evangelical churches supply documents like voting guides.

Bean also found that, within congregations, the association between conservative politics and evangelical faith is firm and unquestioned, and dissenters rarely speak out. However, the actions they take to express this identity are generally more spiritually oriented – Bean found that by making their conservative identity religious, they elevate it above the tawdry world of politics. When social movement organizations enter the accounts of her subjects, Bean gets a variety of responses from them, from those who were heavily influenced without ever actually coming to support them, to those who were initially contemptuous of radio preachers, but ended up

supporting Concerned Women for America in a tertiary capacity (i.e. by sending money.) This indicates that my interviews will need to pay attention to "origin stories," and not assume that my findings from any one interview or observation session will hold true for all groups or supporters. It also means that the messaging that much current research focuses on the messaging and rhetoric produced directly by campus ministries might not be capturing why people come to support them after all.

Many Christian social movement organizations trade on this association; according to Sommerfeldt (2007), Christian Right organizations lean heavily on identification by antithesis, seeking to rally members and potential supporters against defined enemies. However, as we will see in the coming chapters, campus ministries operate in a very different context from the bible studies that Bielo studied, or the explicitly political social movement organizations of the Christian Right. Not only are the emotional associations that they choose for opponents different, but, in chapter 4, we will see that their choice of what to place in opposition to themselves is wildly different and seeks to turn members' attention inward.

These differences reflect the insight of Bernstein (1997), which reveals that "identity" is not a static quality of a social movement's members, nor a simple tag attached to them once they've joined. Instead, building or redefining a positive identity that members can rally around can, itself, be a goal of social movements, and they can deploy their identities in measured ways to control how onlookers perceive them and their cause – and the shift between identities can change the tactics and membership available to movements, as when a more inclusive "queer" identity proved less successful in securing political concessions than a more conventional "gay" identity in efforts to legalize same-sex marriage. However, even if they fail to change the law, movement actors asserting their identity can influence the broader culture. (Bernstein 2014) Choosing when to

emphasize the identity a movement is mobilizing around, and when to keep it subtler, and which audiences should be privy to each are all ongoing strategic considerations, and even members of an organization like Cru or InterVarsity, where the entire point of their membership is to reveal and spread their identities, might decide to rein them in, in some circumstances. This delicate operation is carried out not just in reference to some singular opponent, but in a broad field with many actors that may bear on their tactics and outcomes. (Bernstein 1997, Bernstein 2014)

Both ministries make extensive use of the internet, though members' interaction with their ministries' online presence varies widely. According to Milan (2015), the internet has opened up whole new ways of interacting with social movements, and allowed members to "cherry-pick" causes and actions to take part in, though collectively this runs the risk of making movements more fragile and self-contradictory. This has presented a methodological challenge for analysis, as I have had to avoid pawing through the online offerings of each ministry and creating for myself an interesting hypothetical Cru member identity to analyze, rather than grounding my analysis in the interpretations of actual members. Chapter 2 will describe the ways that I explored the ministries' online presence in this study.

A Secularizing World?

A subject of intense debate, secularization-modernization thesis is the idea that the rise of scientific rationality and cultural pluralism in modern societies is leading to a decline in religious devotion, owing to both the recognition of alternatives to a given faith and a lack of proof. The continuing vitality of religions in the US has been held as a counterexample to this thesis, but recent work suggests that we are taking the same course as Europe, just more slowly (Voas and Chaves 2015). Bielo has noted that their subjects feel that Christianity is becoming anathema to

the nation, and the increasing visibility, prominence, and acceptability of non-Christians (or non-approved Christians) could serve to make them feel as though they been pushed aside, even if they are still mostly in the center of public life.

Whether or not religious pluralism is the reason for it, the number of people in America who identify as Christian is on the decline, sinking from 78% to 70% between 2004 and 2014 (Pew 2014.) This could be a simple explanation for the sense of threat SMOs can; while Christianity is still firmly hegemonic in US society, its grip is lessening and more different ways of looking at the world are becoming broadly acceptable.

Secularization does not "actually" have to be happening in order to be a powerful narrative that shapes SMO activity. Whether or not religiosity is on the decline in the US, if people find the case that it is compelling enough, it can still motivate them just as though it is true. This is particularly relevant because campus ministries, which this project concerns itself with, seem to be on the rise, rather than in decline (Schmalzbauer 2013).

Smith's (1998) subcultural identity theory holds that rather than being weakened by contact with modernity, religions that follow a particular set of strategies can thrive despite or even *because* of it. After all, the anomie and anxiety that modernity is said to create has a tonic in the meaning and belonging offered by stable religious communities. The pluralism of modern society allows for the cultivation of small, strange groups who can feel valid despite running counter to mainstream culture, *including* religious groups, which means they no longer need the nigh-universal acceptance they once had. Also, pluralism allows for more others to define religious groups against, and intergroup conflict can solidify their boundaries and bonds of solidarity. Finally, rather than a "sacred canopy" that believers hide from the world under (Berger 1929), they

are issued "sacred umbrellas" that they can carry around wherever they go – they are armored for contact with the world rather than shunning it.

It would be possible to view this strategy as cynical manipulation, but Bielo and Bean's work suggests that they are being helped from below by potential followers cultivating similar outlooks in *themselves*. I expect that these two forces resonate and shape one another, with individual chapters engaging in frame-alignment processes tailored to their specific audiences. This also echoes the identity formation practices that Guenther and Mulligan (2013) found to be employed by IEAA above.

However, while Smith indicates this as a reason for evangelicalism's continuing vitality, he also suggests that it is a reason for its "ineffectiveness" at causing social change. Twenty years later, it is not at all clear that evangelicals are so ineffective; we will be returning to this theory. (Members that I have interviewed have almost uniformly declined to guess how effective their ministries have been on a broad scale, preferring to focus on the effects that they experience – and create – in their own lives, on an interpersonal scale.)

Research Questions

I entered the field with a tentative set of questions informed by my preliminary research into evangelical social movements, most notably concerning Durrough-Smith's chaos rhetoric, but new questions emerged by testing frame alignment theory against what I encountered in the field. While individual chapters will break them up more, these are the broad questions that animated this study.

1) What frame do these campus ministries present to their members? What problem to they address themselves to, and what solutions do they propose?

1a) Is it held by members on the ground, more or less? Is there variation or dissent?

1b) Does this frame outline a program of social change, or is it purely focused on members as individuals? What understanding of "social change" are they working from?

2) Do the campus ministries ever change significant aspects of their framing or tactics, and what strategies do they use to retain the members who may have come for their previous framing?

2a) How do they reconcile any such changes with their claim of offering the truth of an eternal, unchanging God?

2b) How much does this history of change matter to current members?

2c) How much do individual members contribute to steering these changes?

3) I will be attending meetings week after week, alongside others who attend faithfully. What functions do framing processes serve for these ministries beyond attracting and retaining members?

3a) How much of an opportunity do members get to contribute to this framing, and how?

While there is some overlap, question 1 is largely covered in chapter 4, question 2 in chapter 5, and question 3 in chapter 6, each corresponding to an adjustment or addition to frame-alignment theory that will be outlined in its respective chapter. These are all questions that specifically concern campus ministries, but the answers that this study found suggest anomalies that these adjustments could aid frame alignment theory in capturing, both here and elsewhere.

These questions formed over the course of data collection and informed my subsequent analyses, both outlined in the next chapter.

The Research Sites

Cru

Here, Cru meetings take place in a large multipurpose room in the activities and recreation center (ARC) overlooking a swimming pool. After moving past a table laden with event pamphlets and sometimes even books for the taking, and likely shaking hands or fist-bumping with a staff

member posted at the door, members enter a wide-open and bright. Every piece of furniture and equipment is modular, allowing them to rearrange the room. This also means that, unlike a church, Cru lacks the ability to cultivate their meeting space for spectacle or ambience – ARC room 6 is essentially a blank backdrop for their activities. On most weeks, they favor a wide, shallow layout for the seats, keeping everyone relatively close to the stage, with two projectors showing song lyrics or the speaker's PowerPoint slides so that nobody has to crane their necks.

Every session begins and ends with live music played by a "worship team" up front, for the membership to sing along with. The songs are drawn from a broad pool of contemporary Christian music, and tends towards numbers that try to evoke awe, joy, and sometimes melancholy. After three or four numbers, the masters of ceremonies will take the stage (a pair of students, nearly always a man and a woman) and invite everyone to have a seat.

A significant difference from Cru's online presentation is that these meetings are more light-hearted, especially towards their start. When I started attending in the fall of 2016, nearly every week would feature a short, goofy video or trivia game, but according to Shae, one of the MCs, they have been asked to restrain that aspect of meetings more recently – this helps to moderate the tone of meetings, gives more time to the speakers during the meeting, and demands less time of the MCs to prepare. This resembles one of the classic frame alignment examples, attracting potential adherents to organization events with live music and fun activities, but Dale, the local director of Cru, revealed a more sophisticated use for the MCs antics by pointing out that varying the tone and format of presentations over the course of the roughly hour-long meetings helps to keep students' focus after a long day of school. However, they do not often deliberately calibrate this effect. The MCs have a great deal of latitude in how they conduct their segment and manage the transitions between others, but often have not even been informed of what that week's

sermon will be like, or what songs the worship team will play. Speakers have more freedom still, as we will see below. The groups do coordinate to a degree, but none of them have full power over the final product, the meeting that members actually attend.

After announcements and whatever game or activity the MCs may have prepared for the group, as well as an invitation to fill out a "comment card" with contact information and responses to the various activities, they will cede the floor to the week's speaker. As there is a lot of common ground between the way sermons were handled in each ministry, I will cover that aspect of events in more detail below. The worship team returns when the speaker is done, and after a few more songs, we're set loose, though few members seem to be in a hurry to leave, and most spend at least a few minutes talking with their neighbors or seeking out friends.

Cru's bible study groups are divided first by residence hall; the group I eventually fell in with met in Presby Hall, and a member, later staffer, named Ray gave me his phone number in case I was locked out for a meeting. All of the Presby Hall groups, men, women, newcomers, and eventually grads, would cram together into one room at the start to play an icebreaker game, hear announcements, and go over the basic premise of Cru. This meant that members from all of the various subgroups could mingle and catch up in the leadup to the meeting, fostering a sense of connectedness even if they don't study together. After the preliminary events, groups would split off and spread throughout Presby.

The men's group was generally made up of between 10 and 15 young men, and the leader, a father of one named Jed. The most striking difference as compared to GCF was that Jed was far more likely to have answers that he was guiding the group towards, rather than just asking questions to see what everyone thought. Also, the gulf in age and life experience between him and the undergraduate members was much wider (in that it existed), so in asking him for advice on

scriptural and practical matters, members were calling upon perspective and experience that they lacked. Despite this, discussion was lively, and Jed encouraged members to speak up and share their thoughts. Another notable difference was that, as Cru has a much more defined identity than GCF, there were times that we actually talked about the organization and what it does.

I was a bit less integrated into this group, socially – partially because of my age, but also because everyone kept touch with a phone app that I didn't realize I could get on my PC. Twice during the World Series, I came to an empty room, discovering later that the guys had gathered off-site to thrill to the Cubs' historic victory. Sadly, I had to decline later invitations to social gatherings with the group.

In early 2017, I took part in an attempt to form a graduate bible study group with Cru, but the experience for everyone involved was like herding cats with busy schedules. The initial get-togethers were focused on working out just what the group should be like, but we eventually drifted apart. The next semester, I was surprised to learn that a grad chapter had formed in my absence, a small gathering (single digits each time I attended) of graduate students attending the Presby Hall group. As noted, these meetings were more similar in tone to GCF, though even here, there were answers we were guided towards.

For many members, groups like this were gateways into "discipleship," a more intense and individualized form of study. It will be covered in more detail in chapter 3.

InterVarsity

At the time of the study, IVCF's meetings were more removed from campus, held in a small space called "The Loft," perched above a convenience store on Green Street. Visitors ascend a long narrow staircase, turn sharply to the right and enter an open room with an interior wall

intruding on it, pressing it into an L lined by windows overlooking campus town. The space is wide-open in the quiet hours between meetings, but swiftly becomes cramped when the membership moves in on Friday nights. Flanked by banners bearing InterVarsity slogans, the stage is set in the room's corner, allowing speakers to easily address both sides. Lighting is dim and warm, and the hardwood floor creaks and thuds like a stage beneath visitors' feet. Coupled with the stage being closer and much less elevated, this gives InterVarsity meetings a much more intimate ambiance than Cru's.

Here, as in the ARC, much of the furniture is modular, though the stage and the banners are fixtures, and the sound-system controls are on a sharply elevated platform facing the stage. When the meeting dissolves, the members all stack their seats against the wall and clear their space; this is largely simple practicality, but it also dovetails with regular calls for volunteers for various events and functions, including making posters, manning booths at campus events, taking part in the worship team, and other tasks. Cru has their own ways of encouraging members to take responsibility for their part in the organization, but IVCF's are more visible – and accessible – to newcomers.

The structure of the meetings themselves is very similar to Cru's, though the MCs never led the group in games at an event I attended. The worship team draws from the same general pool of songs (broad enough that you don't get a lot of repeats over the year), and each meeting begins and ends with music. As their diverse membership is a point of pride, and they want to emphasize that they have no ownership over faith in Jesus, they sometimes switch into doing songs in multiple languages, particularly Spanish and Korean. They also carry this practice forward into the All Campus Worship, an event that brings multiple ministries together. The ACW will be covered in chapter 4.

Seeking out a bible study associated with InterVarsity, I found my way to their graduate ministry, joining a study group run by Mae, a medical receptionist, and her husband Ken, an English grad student. Meetings took place in the leaders' apartment, a pleasant space stacked high with speculative fiction novels, theological books, and a smattering of literary fiction. One member would bake to relieve stress, so we occasionally had pastries to enjoy along with the variety of teas that Ken and Mae set out for us. The tone was highly informal and open, regardless of the subject. "Feel free to fight any of this out," Ken told us in an early meeting. "This is your scripture as much as it's ours."

The informal atmosphere was reinforced by casual discussions before and after meetings, and also semi-regular get-togethers outside of the context of bible study, such as potlucks and board game nights. At our very first meeting, nine of us sat around a coffee table and played a hidden role game called *Secret Hitler*, which Ken and Mae hastened to assure us was not at all what it sounded like. In the second year, after some planning meetings by the broader GCF membership, bible study meetings became more structured, but we still had a great deal of freedom in determining what we would talk about. Mae and Ken even solicited suggestions and then conducted a poll on what the theme of the coming semester should be. Unhelpfully, most of the concepts, from "women in the bible," to "villains," to "prophets," tied, turning the semester into a grab-bag.

I had originally interpreted this pattern of taking a greater hand in shaping the activities and curricula of the group to be a difference between InterVarsity and Cru, but my fleeting experiences with Cru's graduate ministry (abortive in the first year, and then appearing just at the tail end of my field work), as well as a former InterVarsity member named Lisette's story of her ouster, suggest that this is more a function of the age group that the particular meetings were aimed

at. The pattern was similar to the difference between undergraduate courses and graduate seminars – undergraduate members would come expecting to be guided by an experienced hand, while graduate students expect that the members will collectively build their understanding of the text, and maybe "fight it out," as Ken suggested.

All four of these sites, as well as the smattering of other events and meetings that I attended over the course of the years, were designed to make newcomers and outsiders feel welcome. Contrary to the evangelical stereotype, members of the ministry were encouraged to save their exhortations and correction for fellow Christians, and present a gentler, forgiving face to outsiders. Even though I only ever described myself as "nominally a Christian," or "culturally Christian," I was assured that I was just as much a member as any other, and my questions and thoughts were entertained alongside everyone else's.

Outline

Chapter 2 will go into detail about the methodology of this study, including the fieldwork and the analysis. In particular, it will explain how I gathered and selected the data that I call upon in later chapters, and show a bit of how I related to the research sites as a researcher. Reflexivity is always important in participant observation studies, but especially so when the research itself leans so heavily on interpretation and emotion.

Chapter 3 is a brief account of the foundation and early history of each ministry. The members I talked to did not generally know a lot about the history of their ministries, either locally or nationally, but the subtly different trajectories of Cru and InterVarsity were set long ago, and their relationship has changed a great deal over the decades before reaching today's cordial state. The account mainly sets the stage for their current framing and activities. It also describes the

ministries in the context of the broader evangelical movement, so as to clearly situate them in their efforts to affect the world.

Chapter 4 focuses on how Cru and InterVarsity's framing attends to the core framing tasks, laying out a brief picture of the problems in the world that they identify, how they plan to solve those problems, and the measures they take to motivate members and potential members to make that plan happen. It then gives further attention to the prognostic framing, outlining the activities that the ministries undertake in the pursuit of their goals. Finally, it indicates the odd twist that the ministries' framing puts on the concept of frame extension, subverting the usual order of core framing tasks by approaching some diagnoses from an existing prognosis.

Chapter 5 starts with an account of the frame bridging processes that Cru and IVCF undertake before introducing a new, thematically similar but distinct process. Frame smoothing tactics are undertaken by social movement actors to justify changes in an SMO's framing by situating the new frame in relation to the old, or by eliding the change itself. These tactics are illustrated with six changes in the framing of one or both of the ministries, major and minor, recent and distant.

Chapter 6 tackles frame amplification, and proposes an opposed but complementary process known as frame detailing that performs similar functions through very different means. Rather than compressing frames down to digestible slogans and images, detailing spreads frames out and introduces nuance and intricacies that outsiders may not be aware of. Detailing can also serve to draw new members deeper by granting them more knowledge of the SMO's views and methods, but it carries the risk of lessening their investment or even driving would-be members away.

Finally, chapter 7 sums up many of the themes revealed by the preceding analysis and points to some future research possibilities suggested by the current study. In particular, it points to ways that detailing and smoothing may have to expand or change in order to apply to different types of SMOs.

Chapter 2 – Methodology: A Familiar Foreigner

This chapter is a basic description of the research questions, data collection, and analytic methodology of this study, and sets the stage for more focused discussions of the data and analysis within each chapter. It will close with a brief discussion of my own positionality and how I related to the research sites and my subjects.

Ethnography and the Extended Case Method

Extended Case Method

The main component of this study is a period participant observation of two campus ministry organizations at UIUC, entering each as a new member and taking part in their activities over the course of a year. Primarily, this study follows the extended case method (ECM) for ethnography that embraces reactivity, recognizing that the researcher is an active participant in the scenes they observe and that they cannot become an objective observer – the best they can do is clearly signpost their theoretical assumptions and personal perspective. (Burawoy 1998) Accordingly, this chapter will end with a brief account of my relationship with evangelicalism and Christianity as a whole, and how it influenced my interactions with members of the ministries.

Extended case method starts with an existing theory (in this case frame alignment theory), and overtly applies it to their research site. Alternatively, ECM researchers can take to the field and then search the literature for theories that describe what they find there (Lichterman 2002). Either way, they seek out places where their chosen theory comes up short in describing the study's particular case and either expand or modify it to better cover such anomalies. This becomes the means by which the ethnography is used to create generalizable knowledge, rather than assuming that the research site is representative of other similar sites. Each of chapters 4, 5, and 6 concern

an area where frame-alignment theory must be built upon or altered to adequately describe the processes and strategies I have observed in the field, and chapter 7 will include a discussion of how these additions or adjustments might be tested or explored in other potential settings.

There is one area where I break with the usual execution of ECM, owing to the particular theory that animates this study. According to Tavory and Timmermans (2018), a mark of ECM is the fact that it commonly treats narratives as being imposed by the researcher and granting a false sense of order and closure to the world that they are observing, and encourages both researchers and readers to always remember that the chronicle that they're reading is artificially circumscribed. In contrast, grounded theory looks for narratives that arise from the field, recognizing that social life is informed by a complex array of narratives that organize and drive the actions of people in the field; rather than the study's narrative being an imposition by the researcher, then, it is instead drawn from the narratives that subjects are experiencing and producing themselves. As frame alignment theory directly concerns social movement actors crafting narratives in the enable a wider range of action by both members and the broader public, it would be difficult for me to disregard narratives that I am drawing from the site, in addition to those I impose to explain the site itself. This point of divergence does not interfere with the execution of an ECM study, but it does influence how the resulting dissertation relates to the body of literature using it.

Extended case method has been noted to have difficulty describing and integrating culture (Lichterman 2002), but perhaps that makes it a fitting partner for frame-alignment theory, which was born out of theorists attempting to strike towards agency and culture from a field that had previously been narrowly focused on structure and resources. In summing up the study, chapter 7 will include an exploration of how this study worked as an ECM ethnography, and how future studies in a similar area might modify this approach. This is not intended as an improvement to

ECM methods as a whole, but rather an exploration of how they can be tuned for the particular kids of sites and theories that this study concerns.

Site Selection

According to the principles of reflexive science, representativeness is not the top priority for selection of cases. Rather, cases should be chosen as a way to challenge and deepen the theories being applied. However, as noted above, a relative lack of research into campus ministries was also part of my motivation for choosing them as a subject, not only to explore uncharted territory, but also because the lack of literature makes them likely prospects for challenges to the existing theory. While I cannot assume that these sites will be representative of all campus ministries, my aim was still to choose sites that would be in some way reflective of the broader evangelical movement, and would serve to build frame alignment theory in directions that would be fruitful for continuing research into it.

There are four primary reasons that I chose Cru and InterVarsity for this study:

1) Both ministries are prominent, highly active organizations with tens of thousands of members across the United States and beyond. (InterVarsity has around 37,000 members, and Cru claims 101,000 within the US.) While this study will ultimately look towards future research, widely-known and active ministries are more likely to give findings that will reflect on the movement of evangelicalism more generally, and what non-evangelicals have to contend with in a social and political landscape that they operate in. Whether it is important to them or not, and respondents varied on this front, members of these ministries are part of a nationwide – or worldwide – community.

2) The organization of both ministries lend themselves to gathering all of the different kinds of data I needed, as will be covered in the next section. A main objective of the study is to first capture the framing that the ministries are promulgating, and then account for how members on the ground receive and make sense of it, which required me to be able to gather data about broad-scale messaging and individual interactions. This university's chapters of both Cru and InterVarsity have large-group meetings where a speaker delivers sermons to an attentive audience, small-scale bible study groups where members are free to discuss and ask questions, and are linked to national organizations with websites steadily producing content for members that want it.

3) There is an informative contrast between the two ministries I have chosen. Cru and InterVarsity are associated with different aspects of the greater evangelical movement – roughly, Cru is more right-wing and InterVarsity is more left-wing. (Chapter 3 will go more into detail about their relationship and politics.) While the ministries maintain a warm relationship and similar theological grounds, they tend to focus on different sorts of temporal issues, and their approaches lend themselves to different politics. Similarly, the ministries have different demographics on this campus, with Cru being primarily white, while InterVarsity has a higher proportion of people of color. This helps the study to avoid generalizing about the evangelical movement drawn narrowly from the perspective of a single organization.

4) Finally, as prominent ministries, Cru and InterVarsity were convenient to find and easy to join. This is important not because it made this study easier to carry out, but rather because new students coming in would experience that convenience as well; these ministries scoop up a lot of new members simply by virtue of being the ones that young Christians know about. There are at least eight campus ministries active on this campus as registered student organizations, and dozens of churches and ministries active in the town.

Once I was part of the ministry, I allowed myself to be sorted into the bible study groups that they placed me in or offered for people like me. InterVarsity offered a graduate ministry called Graduate Christian Fellowship, where I would attend alongside a group of other graduate students. Cru did not, that year, but I was eventually sought out at a large group meeting and invited to join a small group that met in Presby Hall; the Cru groups were split by gender, so apart from get-togethers at the start of each meeting, I would study with a group of young men and the small group leader, a father of two named Jed. I reasoned that my presence would be minimally disruptive if I let them choose where to place me; while extended case method embraces reactivity, I did not want to discomfit or throw members off by inserting myself into a group that I stood out from. In such small, active groups, they were reactive enough.

These four sites – a large group for each ministry, and a small bible study group for each ministry – were the primary sites that shaped my participation in the ministries, and the research questions presented in chapter 1. Coupled with the local and national websites for each website, they were a rich source of data.

Data Collection

Triangulation is an important part of any social movement study; combining multiple methods and multiple sources of data helps to avoid constraining the following analysis with the shortcomings of any one source or method. (Blee and Taylor 2002) Accordingly, this study had three primary means of data collection – participant observation in meetings and events, semi-structured interviews with selected members, and written materials disseminated by the ministries, both online and print.

Participant Observation

Over the course of a year, I regularly attended Cru and IVCF meetings as a new member, eventually finding my way into appropriate small groups in each ministry. Over the course of the year, I attended 46 meetings between the large and small groups of each ministry, and 4 other events, such as doing yard work for older families and proselytizing on campus. When it was not possible to take notes during events, I made certain to record my impressions as soon as possible afterward. In all cases, my notes included both records of events and content, and in-the-moment subjective impressions, forming fieldnotes and a researcher's journal in one. Between meetings I would write to condense and collect ideas, making small interstitial entries in my field notes. As the "ground level" of these social movement organizations is a major focus of this study, the participant observation method allowed me to interact with and hear from average members, and also to *be* a ground-level member trying to work with the framing that they offer.

The primary focus of large group meetings were sermons delivered by staff members in the case of Cru, and visiting speakers in the case of InterVarsity, which took up much of my field notes in large group meetings and added an element of content analysis to this portion of the study. Apart from the content of the sermons, I made note of the announcements, the emotional tone of gatherings, the music and (rare) activities, and any encounters that I experienced before or after. There was less opportunity to participate in these meetings, but whenever a member spoke up or raised a question, I was there.

In small-group meetings, my notes more closely resemble minutes, taking special care to note which points were contributed by members (rather than the leaders), the general level of engagement, and the kinds of questions and (rare) disputes that came up. Here there was a greater emphasis on who was contributing what, as individual members took on greater importance than

in the large group meetings, and it became possible to more closely watch how they grappled with the perspectives presented by the ministry and also what functions it served for them. Discussion frequently included personal matters for the various members – indeed, caring about fellow members and helping them with their concerns was a major part of both ministries' framing – thus, each member was a window into a separate facet of the goals and means of the ministry. Owing to the setting, I quickly grew uncomfortable with taking notes on the specific woes and troubles of members, but continued to take general notes about the sorts of problems that came up, and the responses that the group had for them.

While I was careful to avoid dominating discussion, I was an active participant in both bible study groups, raising prayer concerns, asking and answering questions, offering advice, reading passages aloud, and taking part in group activities. This allowed me to build rapport with some members, particularly in the GCF group where I was among fellow graduate students, and gave many interviews a more comfortable tone. Participating actively also allowed me to occasionally create impromptu focus group discussions around a question that was concerning me. It was very much in the spirit of the extended case method, but I used this power sparingly. Later in the process, members would sometimes ask me about my findings, and I was able to loosely describe some of the later chapters and invite commentary. While this didn't result in large-scale changes to my conclusions, it was good to confirm that they rang true to members' experiences, and incorporate some small expansions that they suggested.

Both ministries hold regular conferences for members across the nation. I did not attend these for financial reasons, reasoning that I did not want to take a financial aid slot from an undergrad who would be attending earnestly. When I learned that the conferences are aimed at more invested members, and featured more straightforward and detailed discussions of the

ministry's operation or tactics than members are likely to see at the regular meetings, I turned to interviews and online resources to learn more about what happens there, outlined below. (This is not a matter of security on the part of the ministries; rather, it is because regular meetings are intended to be relevant to anyone walking in off the street.)

Interviews

I supplemented the participant observation research with 18 semi-structured interviews with members at various levels of both ministries. Using interviews allowed me to foreground the agency of members instead of treating the ministries as monoliths and to hear from people who might not normally get a chance to speak for their ministry. The semi-structured format in particular has the advantages of allowing members to clarify, correct, and challenge my impressions, as well as guiding my gaze to the areas they were most interested in, which widened the scope of my study beyond what I knew existed, going in (Blee and Taylor 2002)

I chose respondents by putting out a general call within both small groups that I attended and then arranging interviews with those who were interested, as well as seeking interviews with the leadership of each local ministry. I reasoned that interviewees who knew me from the small group sessions would be less inclined to give me "safe" answers that followed the ministry's preferred line. Recognizing that this benefit would be more limited in Cru, where the small groups were more broken up, I widened my call with the local director's help and got to talk to people who were involved in corners of the ministry that I had been unaware of. The differences in my experiences between the two ministries will be covered in more detail in the Researchers' Position section below, and in subsequent chapters. Within the pool of people who showed interest, I tried to follow Rubin and Rubin's (1995) principles of completeness and similarity/dissimilarity,

deliberately collecting interviewees who represented different levels of investment and authority, and different demographics.

I listened through each interview several times to get a sense of the general themes, then returned after data collection to build a list of more targeted themes and timestamps for quotes as I advanced through the stages of my thematic analysis (outlined below.)

Interviewees skewed older than the general membership, as many of the people who were receptive to my call were either staff or fellow grad students, and included men and women of a variety of levels of engagement – even one who had been ejected from InterVarsity. The interviews ran from forty-five minutes to two hours, based on how much the interviewee had to say, and their upcoming obligations. The interview questions and consent forms are in the appendix, and were divided based on the interviewee's position within the ministry, with the questions for ground-level members being oriented towards what the messages they took from meetings and what they hoped to gain from membership, while leaders were asked what they hoped members would take from the ministry's teachings and how they hoped to guide their members.

The topics of interviews roved widely, as interviewees were interested in different aspects of the ministries' running, different goals in joining, and different political issues that they were most interested in, including some who were not interested in that aspect of the interview at all. From Brett's efforts to find a date to Jane's work in Bridges International, each offered a distinct relationship with their ministry. My questions started generally enough that each interviewee ended up talking about different aspects of their membership and explaining different aspects of the organization to me. Through these conversations, I was able to see how members interpreted the actions and stances of their ministries, and how important (or unimportant) they were in forming the members' religious and social identities. It also revealed a variety of stories, both

within the ministry and more generally in their faith. While there were some common threads that will be explored in future chapters, I also discovered many of the differences that we set aside in small group meetings. I was also able to pursue more general questions and concerns that did not come up often in small group meetings – particularly secularization and a variety of political issues. Finally, interviews served as my primary window into aspects of the ministries that I was not able to experience directly, such as annual conferences and "discipleship." (These windows were supplemented by articles gathered online and recruitment materials offered at large group meetings.)

Written Articles

As noted in the previous chapter, one area of interest in this study is the distinction between organization-wide framing that a researcher could glean from published materials and high-level members, and the kinds of work that members on the ground level do with the organization's framing. While neither ministry emphasizes their hierarchy in daily operations, it remains that all of my participant observation takes place at a "low" level, in places where any member or prospective member could walk in. This means that most of what I observed was 1) aimed at least partially at newcomers, and 2) were distillations of the organization's framing created by local actors, for the consideration of local members. For windows into the broader organizations, I turned to articles published on the national sites and books about the ministries by high-level members, historians, and biographers.

However, both ministries produce a titanic amount of material to sift through, with websites that put out a slate of new articles every week, and IVCF has a whole publishing house. Fortunately, the extended case method offered a way to guide my choices of articles to analyze: as

I encountered processes and situations that the existing concepts in frame-alignment theory struggled to describe, these anomalies – and thus, the major contributions of this dissertation – defined points of departure to search for articles that would supplement the observations and interviews. This helped me to test my understanding of the organization's framing against a broader context, as well as engaging with a wider range of topics than the sermons of two semesters happened to cover. The ministries' websites served as an initial springboard into the content they offer, and I started gathering by exploring the first two layers of their national website and observing the change in articles over the weeks, recording the face that they present to the world.

Beyond the top layers, the other forms of data collection created a guide for my sampling of articles, revealing topics that loomed large in the ministry's teaching or members' experience of it. Individual chapters will go into more detail about the purposes that the online article analysis served for each one. Chapter 4 makes the most use of that initial exploration, and includes articles covering a broad range of topics that I had identified as important from the content and emphasis of the sermons. For chapter 5, I cast a broader temporal net; having identified times in the past that the ministries had changed significant portions of their framing, I searched for articles that either concerned those changes directly, or topics that are relevant to them (e.g. Martin Luther King Jr Day articles as part of the discussion of how Cru managed the change in its stance on the Civil Rights Movement. Finally, chapter 6 focuses on in-depth instruction directed to invested members, and so took my search to the deeper areas of each website, where I found instructional material for group members and leaders, and more advanced discussion of each organization's framing.

Analysis

Thematic Analysis

The main thrust of this study's analysis was thematic, a form of analysis that searches data (including field notes, interviews, and texts) for distinctive repeating patterns that can be used to describe social groups and phenomena. Accordingly, I carried the analysis out in a two-step process where an exploratory analysis paved the way to the explanatory analysis that crafted my additions to frame alignment theory.

Rather than testing a set of hypotheses, an exploratory analysis discovers what there is to find in the field; my task became to identify the important themes in both ministries' messaging, and the opinions and responses of my interviewees to them (Guest, McQueen, and Namey 2012.) This broad net helped me to avoid "conceptual tunnel vision" a condition where the researcher builds towards their conclusion by omitting possible alternative explanations at the level of data collection (Morse and Mitcham 2002). Many of the themes that I identified were in line with existing frame-alignment theory concepts; for example, I could find many instances of *frame amplification*, but others were not so easy to place Explaining these trickier themes and their relationship with frame alignment processes became the focus of my analysis. While the initial content-driven approach may seem to be at odds with the tenets of extended case method, my explorations were ultimately informed by the body of frame alignment theories. They seem well-confirmed by the existing body of literature, so expanding them would naturally require a different type of analysis.

As outlined in the previous chapter, theorists using frame alignment theory largely focus on strategies employed by social movement actors, whether followed consciously or not; the key concepts of most analyses are verbs that describe what social movement actors are doing with their

frames, such as bridging, amplifying, extending, et cetera. Accordingly, my analysis turned towards ways that the people I observed and interviewed were working with the framing supplied by their ministries. First, to use existing concepts in frame alignment theory to describe the practices and strategies I observed, and then to find practices that it did not give me the tools to describe. Chapters 5 and 6, especially, are devoted to crafting new theoretical tools to account for this – frame smoothing tactics and frame detailing.

My search for themes to explore and interrogate continued along three broad paths. First, I looked to the explicit framing and lessons of the ministry in an effort to describe them, identifying themes that indicated problems that they want to address and means for addressing it – in particular whether these means were individual or collective. Second, I looked for the work that their articles, sermons, and advice were doing for members, which could include unintended or knock-on effects; in particular, I was interested in work that individual members were doing to make sense of the ministry's teaching or put it to use for themselves. Third, I looked for uncertainty, confusion, or dissent among members; I had been prepared for confrontations or angst, but the themes I unearthed along this path were generally not dramatic. In all cases, the analyses were conceived by composing a question that could be posed to either the ministry or its ground-level members (e.g. "What issues does Cru invest the most effort in directing members on?"), and then setting out to answer it through content analysis and direct questioning.

Working with frame alignment theory has required my analysis to take a split ontological approach towards the themes that I highlight. Much like ethnographic methods' treatments of narratives above, a major divide in thematic analysis comes down to whether the themes exist in the field to be discovered or are created and imposed by the researcher to make sense of what they find. (Braun and Clarke 2016) I could simply take a side for the purposes of this study, but I am

dealing in two broad types of data throughout my various collection methods. In describing the organization's framing in sermons, speeches, books, and articles, I treated the themes as existing in the content for me to discover; indeed, many of them were likely deliberately crafted to be identified and absorbed. However, when my analysis turned to discussions in bible study groups, the individual stories of members, and my own responses and interactions as a participant observer, I must acknowledge that I am creating themes in order to apply them to my account of the setting. This created layers of overt and less obvious themes within the framing of each ministry – the less obvious ones were not necessarily "hidden," but I was able to note the lack of emphasis they received.

To a degree, chapters 4, 5, and 6 stand apart as separate analyses, each incorporating the different threads and split ontology outlined above. Each chapter will include a discussion of the relevant themes that came to the surface. To summarize briefly, chapter 4 concerns the basic shape of the campus ministries' framing, and so the analysis focuses on what problems they identify in the world and what they exhort members to do in response, along with notes on how these messages were conveyed in sermons and through written material. In exploring the way that the ministries adapted to changes in their framing, chapter 5 takes a broader perspective in both time and space. The themes in this chapter were crafted for the purpose of contrasting the "before" and "after" framing of each ministry, and strategies for managing the transition. Finally, chapter 6 is the most tightly focused on the practices I observed in person in small-group settings, concerning the functions that engagement in the ministry's framing serves for members who are already convinced and not about to quit. Here, the themes take the form of teaching or messaging techniques, and ways that members can participate in them.

The common thread of all three analyses is an engagement with frame-alignment processes on the part of members and leadership. The question of what problems the ministry is supposed to solve and what members should do to support it is central to all of them.

Researcher's Position

As I acted as a member of both ministries (and remain friends with many members into the present), I cannot disappear as a character of the story; after all, exploratory analyses most often emphasize what emerges from the interaction between the researcher and respondents (Guest, McQueen, and Namey 2012). Many findings relate to how members related to me as a newcomer and odd member out, and I cannot remove my demographics from my interactions and the responses to the questions I posed, and who felt comfortable enough to build the rapport I wanted for interviewees. This section will lay out my initial relationship with evangelical Christianity and campus ministries in particular, so that readers can use it to situate my analysis.

Growing up in rural Michigan, I fell in with friends who attended a fundamentalist Baptist church. I was a serious and literal-minded child, I took the propositions that I absorbed in church as seriously as I did gravity and the greenhouse effect. This meant that many of the people I knew were going to suffer an eternity in torment; a traumatic realization for me, and an annoying one for my non-Christian friends. It instilled in me a bitter sense that any form of faith that did not frighten or hurt could not possibly be genuine, because nobody who was compassionate could be content with the horrors that God would inflict on the unfaithful. Thus, rather than being catapulted out of the faith by domineering parents, I launched myself past my bewildered Methodist and Catholic parents, and then slowly found my way back to a sympathetic perspective as I learned about all of the various types of faith, Christian and otherwise, that those early fundamentalist

teachers had told me to disregard. This background did make certain kinds of rhetoric from preachers and fellow members unpleasant, but it was surprisingly rare in the campus ministry context – in fact, the contrast may have led me to a softer, more forgiving interpretation of some ministry rhetoric than another observer might have settled on. Also, my familiarity with adjacent forms of Christianity allowed me to participate constructively in small group meetings and follow along with more esoteric bible studies and sermons.

However, this familiarity meant that I was deep into fieldwork before I gave a thought to including their baseline assumptions in the analysis, and what seemed to me to be common figures of speech. After all, what would seem commonplace to me that would be esoteric to a reader or visitor from another culture? It was only after bringing a colleague along to a meeting that I realized how troubling their habit of treating Jews as historical characters rather than a people who still exist is, and simple statements by interviewees can be freighted with meaning that seems obvious to insiders, but is not, universally. Data gathered later in the fieldwork reflects a greater effort to gather information that would be less apparent to readers who are less familiar, and quotes from interviewees will include explanations of their implied meaning.

I have a minor personal connection to one of the organizations, as well: my parents met at a Campus Crusade for Christ (now Cru) meeting, though as neither of them would claim to be evangelicals, and would wryly point out that evangelicals wouldn't claim them either. This is less an important part of my religious researcher origin story than it is an interesting bit of trivia that aided me in bonding with ministry members; the tradition of meeting your eventual spouse at a campus ministry is alive and well.\

The result is that I stood out somewhat from the population I was studying, but in ways that the ministries were well-practiced in dealing with, particularly as they operate in an academic

setting. They get many visitors who are skeptical and curious, after all. My political and social leanings, as well as my age, were not nearly the obstacles that I feared, and in fact rarely came up, particularly as I was comfortable and familiar with evangelical tropes. Curiously, it also kept me from ever being on the receiving end of an effort to convert until I finally interviewed the local director of InterVarsity late in data collection.

Conclusion

As noted in the introduction, each of the substantive chapters (4, 5, and 6) will describe their particular analyses in a more focused way. This has been an outline of the data collection process and the methodological underpinning of the study as a whole. Extended case method presents many conceptual and methodological challenges to the researcher, but in exchange it offers tools that allow the researcher to link their site to a broader context without assuming representativeness, and ways to ground their theoretical explorations in processes and experiences happening in the real world. After next chapter's digression to discuss the history of the evangelical movement as a whole and these two ministries in particular, we will start exploring those processes and experiences in more detail.

Chapter 3 – Historical Background: Evangelicalism as a Social Movement

Evangelicalism is a vast, trans-denominational identity movement within Christianity marked by members' belief in the overriding importance of evangelism and the absolute authority of the Bible (NAE 2016). It resists easy classification, being a highly varied, fluid movement with many different ways for individuals to interface with it, but Hutchinson and Wolffe (2012) gave it an attempt by combining the definitions of historians from three continents, along with a variety of finer observations. For the purposes of this study, I can lean more heavily on the historically-based, U.S.-focused definition by George Marsden that they drew upon, which consists of five points that evangelicals emphasize in their faith and religious activism: "1) the Reformation doctrine of the final authority of Scripture; 2) the real, historical character of God's saving work recorded in Scripture; 3) eternal salvation only through personal trust in Christ; 4) the importance of evangelism and missions; and 5) the importance of a spiritually transformed life." Additionally, Hutchinson and Wolffe indicate that while evangelicalism tends to emphasize individualism (which can serve to encourage and empower people whose sense of self-worth and agency are under attack,) members also have the sense of being part of a much greater whole that stretches across the world. If that definition just sounds like default Christianity, then that is a sign of evangelicalism's success!

Broadly, I am treating "evangelical" as a self-designation, and since both ministries broadly identify with the term, I am taking them at their word. However, accepting this classification requires this study to acknowledge that Cru and Intervarsity Campus Fellowship (IVCF) both have relationships with a complex political and social movement that has been active in the U.S. and beyond since long before either was founded, and profoundly shaped the environment that produced them.

The first section of this chapter will outline the meteoric rise of the Christian Right and the struggles of their counterparts on the Left, focusing on their efforts since the late 70s, a time that is popularly acknowledged as an evangelical "awakening" to politics. The second section will focus on the stories of Cru (formerly Campus Crusade for Christ) and IVCF to show how they formed and grew in the U.S.

Evangelical Christian Political Engagement on the Right and Left

Charles Hall (1997) created a statistical analysis to determine the most significant differences between the Christian Right and the Christian Left. He determined that the most reliable indicators of difference were in terms of tradition (in particular that left-wing organizations' memberships were far less likely to be evangelical), and a distinction between individualistic and communitarian approaches to sin – whether social change needs to happen as a matter of individual transformation (on the right), or broader changes in culture and policy (on the left.) The demographics of organizations, including age, race, and sex, were less of a reliable indicator.

Chapter 4 will suggest that this dichotomy breaks down when considering the ministries as our representatives, by describing a way that the more right-wing ministry can approach communitarian thought while the more left-wing ministry still focuses on individuals, but Hall's analysis raises one important fact: despite the current political climate (and evangelicals' overwhelming support for Donald Trump), Christians are active across the political spectrum, and they have many commonalities no matter where they fall there.

The Evangelical Right

Evangelical Christianity is a central religion animating a political and social movement known as the "Christian Right," a loose and shifting alliance of largely Protestant SMOs with mostly white membership in the United States, but it doesn't include all right-leaning Christian-inflected organizations; for instance, militia movements generally have their own disconnected network outside of this alliance. They are often affiliated with churches, but animated by a blend of both spiritual and political means and motives. They primarily seek to motivate evangelical Christians and other Protestants to political action, but cast a wider net when they can, and have made allies among Catholics, Mormons, and even some orthodox Jews (Wilcox 1996).

Just as right-wing Christianity in the US is associated with evangelicalism, Lydia Bean (2014) found that the reverse – evangelicalism being associated with right-wing politics – was also frequently true. However, while there was considerable political homogeneity in the evangelical congregations she studied (overwhelmingly conservative), this did not translate to political activity on the part of the churches themselves or individual congregants. This homogeneity is caused by range of factors that are not directly related to the activity of SMOs, including subtle partisan cues and the activities of "lay opinion leaders" who help less politically engaged congregants to see their political and religious identities (Bean 2014). The most successful evangelical organizations are not directly political (Marsden 2006), and most evangelicals draw more than a set of social or political propositions from their membership, including a sense of moral guidance and certainty, strong affective ties, an identity to be proud of, and a source of material support in hard times. Many are inducted into a way of looking at the world that searches every situation for opportunities to practice their faith, imbuing every moment with meaning (Smith 1998, Bielo 2009, Bean 2014).

Throughout the 20th century, the story of the Christian Right in America can be characterized by sharp rises and falls. These shifts in political participation are often oversimplified into a series of mighty "revivals," with conservative Christians spending the intervening years preoccupied with otherworldly matters. However, each revival was made possible by decades of extensive coalition building and engagement, and the modern Christian Right is the product of deliberate effort on the part of organizers. One such revival set the stage for the Christian Right's arrival in the late 1940s, with the foundation of the National Association of Evangelicals and the commencement of Billy Graham's "crusades," where he encouraged cooperation between different churches and preached a basic version of the Gospel in a way that avoided the rigidity and legalism that were commonly associated with fundamentalism. This new form of evangelicalism was crafted to appeal to a broad range of Christians and serve as a middle ground between the isolation of fundamentalism and the accommodation of mainline Protestantism to secular culture; in both respects, it was a resounding success (Steensland and Wright 2014, Smith 1998).

The birth of the New Christian Right is commonly marked as coinciding with another surge in evangelical political activity, in the late 1970s and early 1980s. This surge was built on two campaigns, the more famous being the foundation of Jerry Falwell's Moral Majority and its successful bid to mobilize evangelicals to vote for Ronald Raegan. The other conflict may have been just as formative, however, as Christian private schools mobilized against the IRS's move to revoke their tax-exempt status if they did not achieve at least 20% minority enrollment. This move came across as an attack by the state against Christianity itself, and drove home to evangelicals that they could not fold themselves away in a hidden Christian world. (Dowland 2015)

White Christians had founded those very schools in response to desegregation in the 1960s, creating the networks that the campaigns for Reagan and against the IRS would rely on. Not all of Christian schools were explicitly designed to help white families "escape" desegregation, but they all surely benefited from the enrollment of fleeing whites. In the 1970s they recognized the need for a new justification for their existence, and found it in clarifying and enforcing a strict view of gender roles (relating to labor, dress, romance, procreation, and more), as well as a firm idea of how families should be organized: the classic "nuclear family," with a breadwinning father, a hard-working mother, and a small number of children. This focus turned the IRS's suit against Christian schools into the actions of a subversive state that would brook no interference in its social engineering experiments. The predominantly white networks grown within these schools, as well as the shared language and understanding built by them, stood ready to be mobilized when another cause, such as Reagan's presidential campaign, called. (Dowland 2015)

The reliance on these networks is one reason that the Christian Right's leaders and supporters are predominantly (but not exclusively) white, and for the continuing divide between white and Black evangelicalism. The other reason is that, despite the support of Billy Graham and the strong resonance of Martin Luther King's rhetoric with their followers, White evangelicals regarded the Civil Rights Movement as one of the sinister, destabilizing forces that beset America in the 1960s – another facet of the counterculture that was sowing disorder and indecency. While feminism quickly took the Civil Rights Movement's place as the Christian Right's nemesis, the gap remains; even today, one rarely sees Christian Right SMOs bring up racism except to talk about "reverse-racism" against white people (Dorrough-Smith 2014). However, more recently, other evangelical organizations, such as *Christianity Today* (Hill 2016) and InterVarsity Christian Fellowship (Lin & Lundgren 2016), are openly acknowledging this divide as a serious problem

and working to bridge it. Ministries are generally more open to the existence of racism than politically-oriented SMOs like the Christian Coalition and Concerned Women for America.

Instead of seeing the late 1970s to early 1980s as the era when evangelicals suddenly became interested in politics, we could instead describe it as the time that they finally linked their fortunes to those of the Republican Party. It may be hard to imagine now, but until Reagan's campaign, conservative, anti-statist, free-market favoring Christians had little motivation to mobilize on partisan lines, as the Republicans had just been offering a watered-down version of the New Deal and a foreign policy strategy of multilateral internationalism (Dowland 2015, Sutton 2014). This revival was Republican organizers seizing the chance to mobilize evangelical voters in their favor, while evangelical leaders seized the chance to influence one of the major political parties to their agenda (Marsden 2006).

In the decades since, right-wing evangelicals have been very successful in guiding the Republican Party, as Schnabel (2013) found when he compared the Christian Coalition's "Contract with the American Family" to the Republican Party's platform in election after election. He found that the Christian Coalition's demands and the Republican Party's platform steadily aligned over the course of the period he studied. This is not a straight win for evangelicals, however, as it can drive away believers of other political orientations (Schnaebel 2013). It also gives political forces inroads into churches, and the Republican Party's interests the weight of faith. This has created a process of mutual shaping that's continued until both conservative evangelical Christianity and the Republican Party have taken on a form neither of them could have imagined at the start of their union (Connolly 2005).

More recently, the evangelical base was freshly energized as the shock wore off after the terror attacks of 9/11. This has done more than supply them with a new enemy to unite against –

it has allowed them to face the crisis alongside a President who was one of them, and confidently spoke of the conflict in Manichean, Good-and-Evil terms. This engagement has hardly slackened with the election of President Obama, who was cast as a homegrown nemesis, almost an antichrist. Rather than a leader they could be confident in rallying beneath, they had gained a new foe to gather against – though in this, even the more conservative campus ministries did not follow the lead of more overtly political organizations in this. (A search for "Obama" on Cru's website nets no results, for instance.) Much as Christian Right political organizations might de-emphasize their theology to appeal to people with similar political aims, campus ministries seem inclined to de-emphasize politics to appeal to people who could come to accept their theological (and moral) outlook. (Sutton 2014)

This effort to broaden their message dovetails with another of the Christian Right's rallying cries: family values. Their campaigns are predicated on the idea of the family as the basic building block of society, with a clearly defined form (the classic American nuclear family) that it needs to take in order to be healthy. People adhering to "proper" gender roles, controlling their sexuality, and building stable family units can solve any number of social ills. This is also a powerful rhetorical tool because lurid images of chaos and decay on this front can persuade people without falling back on strong religious convictions, and the meaning of "family values" is itself so flexible. Using a technique Leslie Dorrough-Smith (2014) calls "chaos rhetoric," they can maneuver so that anyone who does not fall in line with a strict series of stances on homosexuality, marriage, transgender rights (or lack thereof), and abortion can be painted as being against everything good the phrase "family values" can be said to mean (Dowland 2015, Dorrough-Smith 2014). We saw an example above, where the IRS's moves against Christian schools on entirely different grounds were maneuvered into being an attack on family values.

Both the widespread acceptance of their framing of family values issues and the motivation they got from Obama's election point to a fundamental tension that Christian Smith describes in *Evangelicalism: Embattled but Thriving* (1998). Evangelicalism is at its strongest and most strident when it is able to maintain a position of being opposed to the mainstream but strongly engaged with it, so despite opposition, neither evangelicalism nor the political movements it has inspired seem to be fading away (Smith 1998, Marsden 2006). New opponents have appeared in recent years, as libertarian elements, including the Tea Party, become more prominent in the Republican Party and bringing competing sets of economic priorities to bear. Recent data suggests that younger evangelicals are trending away from conservatism, and the increasing importance of issues like poverty, racism, sex trafficking, and the environment to millennial evangelicals may result in a de-alignment between evangelicalism and the Republican Party, but only time will tell (Steensland and Wright 2014).

Owing to this history, right-wing evangelical framing is built of many seeming contradictions. America is a shining city on a hill and a Christian nation, but also a land suffering under the yoke of Secular Humanism. The state is too large and interferes in its subjects' lives far too much but needs to provide moral leadership through its legislation. Jesus will inevitably return to sweep away all injustice, and could at any moment, but we must work tirelessly to make the world worthy of his arrival and oppose the forces that will inevitably rise against him. Interpersonal violence is an unacceptable means of political change, but the military is a beacon of civic virtue and war can be an effective and laudable tool for foreign policy (Stracke 2015, Sutton 2014, Bielo 2009, Macgillivray 2008, Watson 1997).

Navigating these dichotomies is a great challenge, and it is faced by Christians on the ground every bit as much as the organizations calling out to them. Of the two ministries this study

is concerned with, Cru is more closely identified with the Christian Right. However, while the founder of Cru, Bill Bright, was deeply involved with many right-wing Christian causes, he tried to hold his ministerial activities apart from political activism, to the extent that he could. In future chapters, we will see the limited extent to which the Christian Right's choice of rallying issues and frightening rhetoric is reflected in Cru's presentation.

To the Left, Progressive Evangelicalism

Less has been written on left-leaning evangelicals, in part because the Christian Left has enjoyed much less power and prominence despite their continual presence in public life, to the point that some left-leaning Christians contend that the right has poisoned "evangelicalism" – or even that evangelicals themselves have slain American Christianity! (e.g. De La Torre 2017) Much like the Christian Right, Progressive Evangelicalism is a loose association of ministries, churches, and activist organizations; however, many of them disavow the label of being a "Christian Left," insisting that they transcend the political binary in the US by following a Biblical ethos, unlike the Christian Right, which has reduced itself to a political party (Gasaway 2014). Either way, "progressive evangelical" is still seen as something of a contradiction of terms in the U.S. The campaign by the Christian Right above has been so successful that left-leaning Christians have to explain how you can possibly support abortion rights or LGBT identities and still be a Christian. In U.S. politics, they are consigned to the role of a counter-narrative, pushing against the intuitive understanding of the average American.

Moral Minority: The Evangelical Left in an Age of Conservatism by David Swartz (2012) tells the story of how progressive evangelicals found themselves in this unenviable position. According to Swartz, the late 1970s were not merely a right-wing evangelical awakening in the

making, and powerful networks other than the majority-white private schools existed; indeed, a coalition of Left-leaning evangelicals even managed to help propel Jimmy Carter into the White House. It was a surprising success, but Carter proved to be disappointing in many ways, they would soon have to contend with right-wing Christian organizing, and their alliance would prove to be fractious and fragile. Worse, much of the rhetoric that the evangelical Left developed to impress a sense of social responsibility on their fellow Christians and reframe their issues as Christian concerns turned out to be useful to the Christian Right, as well.

As an example of the stressors that progressive evangelicals had to face, we could look to the efforts of white and Black progressive evangelicals – who had been excluded from the pre-existing white evangelical networks noted above – to work together as the movement was struggling to form. Understandably, the works and words of white progressive evangelicals had a hard time appealing to Black evangelicals who hailed from an almost wholly separate attention, and who understandably saw racial oppression as a much more pressing and central issue than the eclectic, uneven spread of issues that progressive evangelicals tended to focus on. And even when the Sojourners and progressive evangelical publications like the *Post-American* paid attention to these issues, they were aimed at white evangelicals, trying to get them to understand that the problem exists at all, and their complicity in it; a useful activity, perhaps, but these basic explanations were themselves of very little use to people of color. Many evangelicals of color who wanted more sustained, focused, and advanced attention for racial oppression frequently gravitated away from the nascent evangelical movement. (Gasaway 2014) A strain of scholarship identifies this as a weakness of progressive evangelicalism, but it could also be regarded as a factor that makes their alliances more distant, without specifically weakening the movement. (Swartz 2012)

Even on the occasions when they successfully organized, left-leaning evangelical organizations often found themselves co-opted by members of other religions or secular allies. For instance, the Sojourners were instrumental in starting both the Witness for Peace and the Pledge of Resistance, explosively powerful movements that swept the nation in demonstrations against an American invasion of Nicaragua while also sending members there to head off attacks by the Contras, who tended to avoid towns where Americans were present. Both organizations grew quickly out of evangelical control as members poured in from other faiths and the antiwar Left, losing most of their religious character, as well as the restrained mode of protest evangelicals preferred. (Eventually, the Sojourners themselves would become more ecumenical.) It seemed that progressive evangelicals can have a substantial impact on politics, but not alone; as we saw with Hall (1997), left-wing Christian organizations tend to have fewer evangelicals even more recently. Their tendency to cast a wider net for supporters and allies is both a strength and a weakness.

As the Moral Majority rose and evangelical Christianity solidified on the right, the evangelical Left found itself under attack from all sides, unable to fit in with fellow evangelicals due to their politics, nor with allies on the Left because of their religious exclusivity and opposition to abortion. (Gasaway describes this in more optimistic terms, indicating progressive evangelicalism as "offering an alternative" to both the Christian Right and the political Left, but it makes finding allies a tricky proposition.) Various Left-leaning evangelical organizations tried to strike a balance between these competing concerns in their rhetoric, such as by combining condemnations of American imperialism with individualist accounts of the human rights of Central Americans being violated, or trying to fit anti-abortion politics into a broader "Consistent Life Ethic" that called for an end to the death penalty, opposition to wars, and support for a social safety

net, but none caught on like the thunderbolt of strident antiabortion and "family values" politics that the Right was able to employ.

Even apart from the struggles springing from their stances on homosexuality and abortion clashing with those of other left-wing organizations, the evangelical left has some internal dichotomies to contend with. Taking a stand against imperialism on one hand makes it more difficult to justify sending missionaries to other countries on the other, particularly if the people of the Global South are telling you that the American brand of "cultural Christianity" is not what they need. (McAlister 2017) Evangelicals of color face the question of whether they should join hands with white Christians in all things or form distinct communities where they might reckon with white supremacy more effectively. (Gasaway 2014) As we will see in chapter 5, Cru and InterVarsity break in opposite directions on this question, and not in the directions that we might expect. While the Right has weathered their dilemmas handily, the Left seems to have had more trouble.

Nevertheless, the progressive evangelicals refused to quietly fade into the background. Swartz treats them as having fallen by the wayside, but since Obama's election, they've found new prominence, both in countering the Christian Right's vicious attacks on him, and in having a President who is both left-leaning and open about his faith – and their organizing has hardly slackened since Trump's election in 2016. Evangelicals have demonstrated against the wars in the Middle East, much as the Sojourners and InterVarsity had opposed wars in Vietnam and Central America, Biblical feminists argue for the substantive equality of women in the church and beyond, and progressive evangelicals even try to guide co-religionists to a more structural and historically-grounded understanding of the sin of racism. Even opposition to abortion is not a perfect litmus-test for evangelicalism among progressives. (Gasaway 2014) And even environmentalists, a

frequent foe of the Christian Right, can find allies in evangelicals who are concerned with Creation Care, or a firm resolve to use the dominion that God gave to humans over the Earth responsibly and look after His creation. (Harrell 2012) As long as the U.S. is majority Christian, Christianity will be a powerful tool for organizing social action, and progressive readings of the teachings of Jesus are not likely to go away.

Swartz points out that the comparative fortunes of evangelicals on the right and left were not foregone conclusions. In particular, he indicates the way that the political parties in the U.S. broke on the question of abortion, and the evangelical right's ability to devise rhetoric that cast the Left as the enemies of family values, was "more contingent than certain." Beyond Swartz's observation, abortion being the issue that could decide their fate was *itself* historically contingent, as Christians' stances on the issue were never as straightforward as right-wing activists now make it seem. According to the Reverend Dr. Ignacio Castuera (2017), Christian teachings on abortion had been ambiguous for centuries, and the U.S.'s abortion laws had been loosening over the course of the 20th century with the tacit agreement of protestant churches until conservative Christian organizers pressured evangelicals to take a firm stance on the issue in the 1980s. As the bible says very little about abortion, and one of the central pillars of evangelicalism is the authority of the bible, Castuera is not surprised that it took political organizers to turn it into an absolute, black-and-white moral issue that could make or break the political activities of evangelical Christians.

Of the two ministries, InterVarsity has been more closely associated with the evangelical left. IVCF took part in some of its attempts to cohere in the 70s and 80s, and they carry the influence of these attempts forward. Even today, they show interest in economic and social justice for poor and marginalized people and was noted by members of Cru I interviewed to have a reputation for being highly concerned with such issues. Even if the progressive evangelicalism

isn't as stable or powerful an alliance as the Christian Right, there are still left-leaning evangelicals, and a community like InterVarsity's is far more likely to make a comfortable home for them than a ministry like Cru.

An Easy Divide?

It is tempting to treat evangelicalism as a movement divided, with firmly distinct left and right wings represented by InterVarsity and Cru, respectively. However, to do so would distort our understanding of both the vast, fractious mass of evangelicalism and the relationships that the two ministries have with that movement and one another. Beyond the ambivalent, measured nature of their political engagement, three elements of both the broader evangelical movement and the ministries within it defy an easy division into left and right-wing counterparts.

1) The evangelical left and right may be opposed in many aims, but they are connected through both churches and tactics, inspiring one another and sharing (or competing for) some of the same faith communities. (Swartz 2012) While the members of Cru and InterVarsity that I talked to had different general leanings, neither organization is devoted to a particular place on the political spectrum, and both have members with a wide range of different political inclinations and foci. For most members, the specific political stances of their organization were less important than the theological grounding they had and the community they offered to members.

2) Generally, the stances that the ministries take on various issues will not always be reliably right-wing or left-wing in a U.S. context. For instance, while InterVarsity's concern for racial and economic injustice could be read as left wing, their stance on abortion and how members should handle same-sex attraction is firmly conservative. (Gasaway 2014) As noted above, this awkward fit is one of the reasons that the evangelical left has struggled for prominence among

evangelicals and acceptance among left-wing organizations, and, in situations where political stances and activities are emphasized, positions organizations like IVCF as outsiders to both.

3) Perhaps most importantly, InterVarsity and Cru have joined hands with one another and a long list of other campus ministries across the nation and consider themselves to be part of a single movement. (Fea 2018) Their primary goal is to bring college students and the people of countries they send missionaries to into the fold, and minister to them once they are there. Their principles and ideas of virtue may suggest certain political stances, but these do not take priority over the central mission to bring souls to Christ and let members learn and grow from the personal relationship they build with Him. Viewed in this light, their different political inclinations blur the line between motivations and tactics (or diagnostic and prognostic framing.)

Nevertheless, while they are difficult to firmly place politically, each ministry bears the marks of Christian political organizing, and their activities have political consequences in the U.S. and abroad. Their mission is still to change the world, even if their goals are harder to assess from a secular perspective.

The Rise of the Ministries, and their Reconciliation

This section will outline of the history of Cru (formerly Campus Crusade for Christ), and InterVarsity Christian Fellowship (IVCF.) The objective is not to give a comprehensive overview of their whole decades-long histories, but rather to hit on relevant points that are important for understanding their current stances and activities.

Accounts featuring Cru and IVCF tend to have different tones and focus on different aspects of the organizations. For instance, stories of Cru tend to focus more directly on Bill Bright, the founder, and his individual attitudes, innovations, plans, and desires. Meanwhile, even an

institutional history of InterVarsity that is overtly framed as a biography of C. Stacey Woods (MacLeod 2007), the founder of IVCF USA, still takes a lot of time to talk about the other major players in the ministry, letting many of them headline sections that mark them out as important to the overall story. My accounts here will reflect this to a degree, in part due to the materials available, but also because the overall focus of this project is the organizations' framing, which includes their self-conception. If the singular figure of Bill Bright is more important to Cru's picture of the world than C. Stacey Woods is to IVCF, then Bright is also more important here. However, while histories of the organization may treat him as a towering figure, Bright does not come up very often in Cru's day-to-day self-presentation.

Foundation

Intervarsity Christian Fellowship is the older of the two organizations, and consciously traces its lineage and inspiration back to the earliest Christian student groups in England. There, IVCF got its start in 1928 after splitting off from the Cambridge Inter-Collegiate Christian Union (CICCU), and almost immediately dispatched a charismatic, hard-driving missionary named Howard Guinness as an "Apostle to Canadian Campuses." The first meeting of the Canadian InterVarsity Christian Fellowship in Kingston was a demoralizing flop, but it was the start of a rapidly-growing ministry. According to Guinness, students in Canada were hungry for an alternative to choking modernism, and InterVarsity was to become more than a bulwark against it, but a site for students to stand visibly and proudly as Christians. (Hunt & Hunt 1997, MacLeod 2008)

In the late 1930s, the general secretary of the Canadian IVCF, C. Stacey Woods, started traveling south to help fledgling chapters in the United States. There they found a religious

landscape in colleges that seemed barren, but was full of opportunity – there were many campus ministries, but they were small and isolated, battered into a defensive mode by the waves of modernism and the embarrassment of the Scopes trial. They had initially tried to avoid campuses that were tended to by the League of Evangelical Students, but there was a reason that American students were writing to IVCF for advice and aid in building their ministries; the primary weakness that our authors identify in LES was a preoccupation with apologetics and other heady theological matters, with little attention paid to the practical concerns and needs in undergraduates' spiritual lives. Owing to this conflict, a former LES member named Charles Troutman joined ICVF at Woods's urging, and the duo became a "dream team" for decades, Troutman's thoughtfulness, restraint, and theological chops balancing Woods's energy, charisma, and administrative skill. (Macleod 2008)

When Troutman returned from serving in World War 2, he found a vastly expanded IVCF – many had turned to religion over the course of the war and in its wake, and returning veterans were supplying a core of members with responsibility and leadership skills. He also found that Woods was spreading himself thin by dividing his efforts between IVCF Canada, IVCF US, and IFES (International Fellowship of Evangelical Students), and the organization of the ministries hadn't evolved to account for this reality, resulting in executive staffs floundering in the absence of direction. These difficulties would grow into a conflict over the basic mission and organization of the ministry, and spawn a dysfunctional culture among the upper levels that would continue to hinder the ministry long after Woods left. While official policy has varied over the years, IVCF has benefited from a relatively decentralized structure that insulates ground-level chapters from this sort of mayhem. (Hunt & Hunt 1997)

While accounts of InterVarsity's history start with a long lineage of organization and have teams of preachers and administrators as protagonists, Cru presents itself as being born of a singular vision. According to the official biography of Bill Bright, Campus Crusade for Christ was born on a spring night in 1951 when Bright had a profound vision of witnessing to the whole world, and receiving an invitation for a personal relationship with Christ. His friends and colleagues he shared his vision with would support and encourage him, and one would give him the name for his new ministry. (Richardson 2000)

The newly dubbed Campus Crusade for Christ's early years were a constant struggle to keep up with its own reckless expansion, but donors and members always came through for them. They were also aided by an early decision to have local chapters raise their own funds, which had the duel benefits of aiding the overall organization's solvency and lowering chapters' dependence on the central office. As we will see below, another recurring struggle was to stake out its place in the brewing "culture wars," and it came into its own during the Berkley Blitz, loudly, proudly taking to Berkley's "free speech platforms," which likely did not result in as many converts as they claimed, but raised the public profile of the organization and marked them as willing to take a stand for Christianity. Bright's innovations included using his expertise in sales to design a range of standardized strategies for proselytization, as well as individual personal devotional techniques like "throne checks" and "spiritual breathing," which we will cover more in the next chapter. While scriptural knowledge is still important, Cru gave more emphasis to members building a personal, affective relationship with God. (Richardson 2000, Turner 2008)

But what kind of a world was Bright launching his ministry into? In *From Bible Belt to Sun Belt: Plain Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism,* Darren Dochuk covers a vast swath of evangelical history from the late 1910s to 1980, charting

the rise of southwestern evangelicalism from the margins of Depression-era America to the halls of power. However, if we focus on the postwar years, just before Campus Crusade's foundation, we can see that Bright had his vision at exactly the right moment.

In 1948, the Soviet Union had just detonated its first atomic bomb, and evangelical preachers like a then-unknown Billy Graham spoke with the conviction that America faced nuclear annihilation if it did not repent and come to God. The era offered more than fear to assuage and a common foe to unite against, however, particularly where Bright found himself. The National Association of Evangelicals had recently formed, promising support to beat back the terrible conspiracies of liberalism and modernism. Meanwhile, the Southern Baptist Convention was moving to centralize and bring its churches into line, purging their rolls of unruly and overtly prejudiced preachers to create a more diplomatic and presentable face as they spread out and new waves of people came to the southwest to work in the defense industry.

But this centralization was destined to be loose; as suburbs sprawled through southern California around the new defense industries, successful church leaders realized that proliferation, rather than physical centralization, was the way to adapt. Potential congregants were being uprooted and scattered over a broad area, so many small churches would reach them much more effectively than the large, impressive churches that used to draw seekers. The churches that could not adapt to the new environment saw their membership plunge, and many receded from prominence or even closed their doors. This was not merely a reorganization of church resources, but an upheaval that unmoored many churches from higher-level control, allowed a whole new crop of preachers to find their voices, and gave congregants more voice in the form that their services took through market forces; if they did not like their preachers, they could always find more.

Such an environment was perfect for parachurch[1] ministries that sought people who might otherwise have ignored religion, and Dochuk positions Bright as one of the first to successfully ride this wave, alongside Demos Shakarian. (I might add that InterVarsity was benefiting from these currents as well, and LES might have, had it lasted this long.) While Demos sought to minister to Christian businessmen of his own generation, Bright turned to the next generation by bringing his ministry to the underserved campuses of America. Unfortunately for InterVarsity, this new Campus Crusade saw its campuses as underserved, and would crash into schools that had struggling IVCF chapters with a team of 15 staffers ready to go; whereas InterVarsity was a mission made up of students, Cru was a mission *to* the students. This was one of many factors that contributed to friction between the ministries, which we will come back to in a later section. (Hunt & Hunt 1991)

Much like C. Stacey Woods, Bill Bright's autocratic and somewhat inconsistent leadership would lead to conflict within Cru's ranks, though for them it was less destructive, and Bright would remain an important figure even after leaving the formal organization. Ironically, a tendency of Bright's that Turner pointed out as frustrating to his staffers, his habit of getting "visions" that his subordinates would then have to sort out the details of, was cited by Hunt & Hunt as something that Woods's leadership style could have benefitted from. (His distance, combined with his tendency to micromanage, left staffers adrift.) As we will see in the section on conflict below, one of the differences between IVCF and Cru was that InterVarsity was more understated and indirect, so this might be an aspect of the founders' personalities coming through in the organizations' conduct. (Hunt & Hunt 1997, Richardson 2000, Turner 2008)

[1] A parachurch ministry carries out its mission without a specific church watching over it. While members are encouraged to have home churches, neither Cru nor IVCF are a part of any particular church.

As noted above, we should not overstate the novelty and importance of defined "revivals" in the course of its involvement with the rest of American culture – after all, such revivals were only made possible by the constant effort of ministers and activists to cultivate Christian populations that could be "activated" this way. Likewise, the Scopes "monkey trial" and similar marquee events were not devastating blows that knocked Christianity out of its revivals, and it does not do to overemphasize them. However, the naïve historicizing that Sutton writes against remains important to this account because, as he points out, many Christian ministries and movement organizations *also* engage in it, and my focus is on the picture that they paint of the world. While a historian could recognize that the Scopes trial is mainly important insofar as it reflects a broader cultural shift, and was not, itself, the reason for Christianity's decline in public influence, the event was still a touchstone in the framing of these ministries, and so important to this work. (Turner 2008, Sutton 2014)

In the case of both ministries, they steadily worked to create robust, decentralized organizations that would survive friction and disagreements at the higher levels while still maintaining coherency between chapters, though IVCF in the U.S. seems to have decentralized more quickly and decisively. Another point that they have in common was that they were identifying an under-served or mis-served populations and preaching/marketing to them. In the case of Cru, though, the underserved population they were identifying was one that InterVarsity was already trying to serve! As Cru grew, this would lead to tension between the two ministries. (Hunt & Hunt 1997, Richardson 2000)

Rivalry and Alliance

Despite their congruent goals, these campus ministries have not always been on friendly terms with one another. Just as InterVarsity had criticized the insularity and silence of the League of Evangelical Students, it faced the very same criticisms from the fledgling Campus Crusade for Christ, with a side of "spiritual deadness." Its understated manner was seen as failing to take a stand against the plague of secularism. Meanwhile, members of InterVarsity viewed sales-inspired style as crass, and were suspected that the vast numbers of conversions and dedications they reported were wildly inflated. The leaders reached out to one another at different times, and local chapters had varying relationships, but for Cru's early life, it looked as though the organizations would not come to an accommodation. (Turner 2008, Dochuk 2012)

Dochuk's description the era that birthed Cru makes these conflicts, LES vs IVCF and IVCF vs Cru alike, much more understandable. Much like the evangelical churches springing up in the new suburbs, parachurch organizations were entering an era where they couldn't assume a congregation based on area or denomination, and couldn't rely on an imposing building to draw for them. The university students these ministries reached out to were consumers in an ever-expanding religious marketplace, where the authority of the preachers and financial support were only granted provisionally, rather than taken for granted. A ministry that lost too many members or donors might simply disappear, as the LES eventually did. In this light, we can see how the two ministries could be grateful for one another's work in the abstract, while also wishing that the other would leave the campuses they share, and stop competing with them for donors. (Dochuk 2012)

And yet if we visit Cru today, we can find that InterVarsity is listed among the recommended ministries for curious parents (FAQs 2017), and InterVarsity is referred to favorably and even cited among Cru's articles. Similarly, InterVarsity recommends Cru in return, and posted

an upbeat article congratulating them when they changed their name from "Campus Crusade." In my own formal and informal interviews, I found that the members of each organization thought well of the other (though they don't generally think of the other much), with the sharpest critique between them that I have encountered so far being InterVarsity leaders offhandedly acknowledging some ethnocentric tendencies in Cru. What changed?

One possibility is the 1971 signing of the Trail West Agreement between Cru, IVCF, the Navigators, and Young Life, where they pledged to work together collectively instead of competing for students. It was renewed again in 2010 alongside 13 other ministries as the Chicago Agreement. I will return to its contents in more detail in chapter 4, but for now, I will take a page from Sutton and not put the entire shift in attitude down to a single event, particularly one that none of the institutional histories I have access to see fit to even mention the Trail West Agreement. After all, the conditions had to be right in all four ministries to meet and sign in the first place – it was not a breakthrough out of nowhere. Writing about the Trail West Agreement is thin on the ground, but a *Christian Post* article on the 2010 renewal in the form of the Chicago Agreement (Kwon 2010, Fea 2018) outlines some reasons that the ministries feel that this is a good time for it – and if we look at the histories of the organizations, we can see that the leadup to the 1971 agreement may have been very similar.

According to the *Christian Post* interviewees, Christianity is facing a crisis of declining church membership, but it is not a decline of religiosity; instead, college students are becoming more "spiritual, but not religious," meaning that they are still potentially open to the messages of a spiritual nature if said messages are not attached to cultural baggage that they find repugnant. This echoes the environment that accounts of both Cru and InterVarsity describe in the 60s and early 70s. (Hunt & Hunt 1997, Richardson 2000) According to our authors, campuses were full of

students who were questioning long-held assumptions, seeking, and carefully considering their options. Hunt & Hunt include an evocative image from a letter of serious-eyed students emerging from the counterculture with notebooks in hand, asking authority figures and one another deep questions, taking down notes, and retreating to consider deeply. Whether or not this was an accurate picture of the student body of the time, it was the prevailing feeling among ministry leadership. (Hunt & Hunt 1997, Turner 2008, Kwon 2010)

In summary, it seems that the mix of opportunities and challenges facing campus ministries currently reward having a great many ministries with varying approaches. There is room for all of them to grow, and no one winning Christian formula. Attacking one another would only create a less welcoming community for potential converts who would be drawn to one or another of them, and not ensure any benefit for the attacker.

The Ministries' Political Engagement

As long as they have existed, campus ministries have always had an ambiguous relationship with politics. Neither of these ministries is an overtly political organization, but their stances on social issues have political implications, and membership has been predictive of conservative positions on social issues (Todd et al. 2016). Turner (2008) characterizes this relationship as a conflict between custodial (watching over the world) and evangelistic (spreading the word) impulses, and charts the particularly difficult time that Cru has had in navigating this dilemma.

As noted above, Bright got in at the ground floor of the Cold War as an ardent anticommunist, and most of his friends were rich, conservative Republicans. While Campus Crusade never lobbied, it did counter-protest left-wing movements, and Bright evangelized to

lawmakers and captured their attention with ministries like FamilyLife and Christian Embassy DC. His staff skewed conservative as well, to the point that Campus Crusade had to drop Tim LaHaye's book *The Battle for the American Mind* because it was distracting them too much from their main mission. For a time, Bright tried to take part in activism without being too politically visible so as not to damage the prospects of his ministry, but as Campus Crusade grew in prominence, this became harder and harder. By the late 80s, he was largely recognized as a figure of the Christian Right, whether he liked it or not. (Turner 2008)

InterVarsity, meanwhile, rose just in time to witness the start of World War II, and unhesitatingly endorsed the conflict as a necessary battle against evil, even before the US joined in. Later, they would take a stance against segregation, and refuse to segregate their own meetings, which is perhaps echoed by their current support for Black Lives Matter. More recently, InterVarsity has been in the news for two incidents: one is a formally announcement of their stance on sex and marriage (largely in line with conservative Christian mores), coupled with a request that any employees who don't agree with it take their leave, rather than continue to work for a ministry that doesn't agree with them on such an important issue. (MacLeod 2007)

The second incident was being "de-recognized" at the University of California and other campuses because they require leaders to affirm their statement of faith, which would run up against nondiscrimination clauses. (IVCF Press Room 2019) InterVarsity's brief turn as a renegade student organization has invited furious commentary from Christian Right commentators, but InterVarsity itself has been much more phlegmatic about the conflict, and their website has had little to say. The one time that incident came up in a large group meeting, the speaker dismissed it as "unfortunate" and moved on. This reflects their overall ambivalence towards political involvement – note that, apart from the all-consuming world war that everyone had to have an

opinion on, most of the issues they make public stances on are more matters of how individual spaces and lives are organized, rather than matters of public policy. When the issue bears on questions of church and state, IVCF tries to strike a conciliatory tone and avoid saying too much even if it affects them directly. (IVCF Press Room 2019)

Both accounts reflect Turner's custodial vs. evangelistic conception, and show us a challenge of "marketing" that faces any ministry. Taking overt political stances can drive potential members away and detract from other aspects of their message – they want to spread their word to *everyone* on the campus, not just people who lean conservative or liberal. However, politics reflect values and preferences for polices that have real consequences for peoples' lives, and how convincing can you possibly be if you don't take any responsibility for your influence as it relates to these issues? Chapter 4 will go into greater detail of how the local chapters of Cru and InterVarsity navigate this challenge.

The Great Commission

Central to both ministries is their shared evangelistic mission – the "Great Commission" to spread Christianity to every land. The next chapter will go into the messaging of these ministries in more detail to discover what their frame on the national level. The Great Commission is an inspiring objective, but it requires the cooperation of actors across the nation and beyond, and there are many steps that go into it. We will see how Cru and ICVF approach the challenge.

Conclusion

This chapter has briefly sketched a history of the evangelical movement in the United States, and the strange place that campus ministries such as IVCF and Cru have carved out within

it. When I treat the ministries as social movement organizations, this is the movement that they are a part of – or rather, as evangelicalism is not a monolith, the cluster of related movements that they grew from. While Cru has close ties to the evangelical right and InterVarsity is descended from the struggling evangelical left, they have broadly agreed that their shared mission to spread the gospel across the world is paramount, and other issues can take a backseat so that they can cooperate. This agreement despite sharp differences is the foundation of the relationship between the ministries as I found them in the 2016-2017 school year.

Similarly, while neither local chapter of the ministry is a perfect microcosm of the national organizations, and both have been guided by many hands, the stories of their founders and the methods and priorities that they set still carry through into the present. Cru's tactics still included snappy, decisive statements and firmly organized presentations, while InterVarsity still brought in speakers from all over and let them bring their variety of styles, some punchy and some meandering. However, as per their reconciliation, they also showed signs of learning from one another, and the other ministries on campus.

A variety of factors, including the ministries' complex relationship with politics, the enormous sweep of their framing as covered in the next chapter, and the fractious nature of evangelicalism itself means that the activities of the campus ministries in this study do not map neatly onto a nationwide blueprint for mass evangelical mobilization. However, in the context of the United States, where evangelicals have been mobilized for decades in a continual (and successful) effort to bring about changes in its politics and culture, they cannot help but participate in that mobilization. One of this study's aims is to reveal the shape and nature of their participation.

Chapter 4 – Every Corner of a Broken World, and Every Facet of a Transformed Life: Campus Ministries and the Core Framing Tasks

Broken down to its simplest form, the goals, means, and motivation of Cru and InterVarsity seem to be straightforward. They seek to improve the world by spreading their religion, which will help in the temporal sense by encouraging in individuals a harmonious and virtuous mindset, while also acting supernaturally by giving God's will more conduits through which to act upon the world. However, spreading a religion is not a simple matter, and the ministries do not consider their job to be done once a new believer has said the "magic words." Even if everyone at the university were an avowed Christian, they would still see a need for ministries to guide, connect, and tend to the believers.

This chapter will start with a description of how the ministries attend to the core framing tasks of diagnosing a problem in the world, coming up with a prognosis to solve it, and motivating members to carry that prognosis out. After a more detailed description of their tactics in recruiting, building a community, relating to politics, and guiding emotions, the chapter will close with a description of how the ministries' approach to the core framing tasks subverts the usual way that social researchers approach them. Owing to decades of practically limitless frame extension, there is almost no topic that some members of the ministries will fail to show interest in, and for long-running organizations with broad interests, the implied order of diagnosis->prognosis->motivation does not always hold true as they continue to adapt and build on their framing. The conclusion will discuss the broader significance of this subversion, and what it could mean for future social movement research.

Diagnosis, Prognosis, and Motivation

This section will briefly cover how the frames shared by both campus ministries see each of the three core framing tasks outlined above, paying particular attention to how the emphasis differs between the two. While the framing of nationwide (and beyond) organizations with hundreds of chapters and tens of thousands of members cannot be perfectly consistent, there are common threads that came up in the weekly large group meetings, in bible studies, and in articles offered on the ministry's website.

Diagnosis

Cru and InterVarsity are working from their own versions of an evangelical Christian frame, which operates at many different levels, from the individual, to the community, nation, world, and cosmos. At the grandest scale, they start with a daunting proposition: for both ministries, a recurring theme in sermons, writing, and even conversation is that *the world is broken*, and so are we. Sin is an essential part of human nature, and the nature of everything that humans build, which calls for compassion (nobody is without sin) and wariness (of institutions, others, and yourself.) In this cosmology, our only hope to be free of sin is through the mercy of Jesus.

The ministries agree on many of the worldly problems that they identify as manifestations of this brokenness in our day-to-day experience, and a common theme of sermons in both settings was to highlight some sin or difficulty that the speaker is having trouble with, framed broadly enough that the audience can identify with the core problem, and then applying lessons drawn from Bible verses to defeating it. Every semester covers a broad range of topics, but the two ministries tend to emphasize different areas. Cru spends more focus on individual failings and difficulties – short-sightedness, selfishness, and anger, for example. Jed, the leader of the Cru

bible study I attended, gave a sermon where he described his constant struggle against time itself, restlessly, furiously filling every moment with more work, more obligations, to the point that no matter what he's doing, even tending to his sick child, he is always thinking about something else. This pattern subjects him to constant stress and causes him to fail in important responsibilities to his family and the people he ministers to. If this story sounded familiar, and for many listeners, it did, he urged us to find comfort and rest in Jesus (Matthew 11:28-30), as contrasted from constant entertainment, procrastination, and social media.

InterVarsity, on the other hand, pays more attention to broader social issues, many of which have been coded as "left-wing" in modern politics, such as racism, mental illness, and culture clashes. For example, a Korean-American speaker named Kathy Khang described her experiences with clinical depression, and the way that they were mediated by a culture that she treasures, but that stigmatizes mental illness even more than the United States. Ranging between these topics, she delved into the spiritual dimensions of dealing with illness, difficult family members, uncaring medical services, and a culture that you sometimes don't feel a part of. She also directed listeners to a range of resources both spiritual and secular that can help them if they face mental illness. Surprisingly, her sermon also struck a blow against cartesian dualism, stressing that one's mind is subject to physical forces – strange to hear in a religious setting, but necessary for listeners to understand mental illness in practical terms. In her view, silence on this topic gives the devil power, allowing him to play with the expectations and fears of both the person suffering the illness, and their friends and loved ones, driving them all to ruin.

One social issue that they both apply this frame to, in very similar terms, was same-sex attraction. Both ministries hold that same-sex attraction is a reflection of the brokenness of the world, rather than something that is uniquely wrong with the person experiencing it. Members

who experienced same-sex attraction and take this formulation to heart are thus alienated from their own desires, and confronted by a foe within their own mind and body. In this way, the ministries try to affirm their conservative stance on LGBT issues while still encouraging compassion for LGBT people who are facing a struggle other Christians are not, rather than a return to the open persecution of past decades.[2] As Peter, an intern with Cru, put it: "On those issues, the Church dropped the ball *hard*, and needs to be held accountable for that. Apologize, at least." However, members were not uniform in their stances on this front – members I interviewed generally agreed with the above description, but InterVarsity's graduate ministry, Graduate Christian Fellowship, also had a few members with attitudes like Soo Min, who said, "Back then {when the Bible was being written}, we didn't know much about LGBT – as we call them, now, LGBT – people. The Bible doesn't change, but sometimes we should change our interpretation." As we walked away from the interview, she added, "I think God made them, too." This is a common counter to anti-LGBT sentiments within Christianity – Soo Min was asserting that God had not made a mistake by making a person gay, or bisexual, or transgender, and that respecting people and the God who created them necessarily entails respecting their identities.

The foregoing description was somewhat imprecise, conflating LGBT people, identities, and attractions; this is because sermons and articles produced by both ministries focus almost exclusively on same-sex attraction as a "problem" for individuals to grapple with. This is a more sinister manifestation of the ministries' drive to create an answer to any problem a person might face; here we see. In the future, I will use this term to refer to this particular approach of campus ministries towards LGBT members (and friends of members.)

[2] Editorial note: "Love the sinner, hate the sin" is not very a very compelling defense of their position.

On a more immediate scale, InterVarsity was initially founded because students in higher education were poorly served by existing ministries, which either did not extend their reach onto the campus, or dealt in abstract scriptural interpretation void of practical application to real life. Similarly, decades later, Cru rode a wave of evangelical fervor into campuses that it saw as sorely underserved, seeing the chapters of IVCF already there as academic and lifeless. Chapter 4 will go into more detail how these two ministries and their other competitors managed their collision, but it is important to note for now that Cru and InterVarsity view one another as allies; "rival" ministries no longer figure into their diagnoses as problems.

A lack of faith on campuses may seem like a perplexing diagnosis in a country where 70% of the population identifies as some type of Christian (Pew Foundation 2014), and members are under no illusions that Christians are persecuted or marginalized in American society – in part because, as Cru regularly sends students out on mission trips to "East Asia[3]" and Czechoslovakia, while InterVarsity has its own slate of mission trips and many members who are international students, they know what it looks like when Christians are genuinely beset. This especially came to light in the "Seven Letters to Seven Churches" sermon series, which covered the first chapters of *Revelation* – every week we would be treated to a tale of how the Christian churches were faring in the heart of an Empire that held them in contempt, and these accounts were contrasted strongly against today.

Lacking persecution does not mean that we live in a Christian society, however. "I don't know if we're walking away {from Christianity} as a whole, but I feel like we're less pronounced," Beth, a member of GCF, told me. "There are fewer people, I think – I think there are more closeted

[3] Cru refers to their Chinese ministry as "East Asia," and one interviewee told me that this was to protect their contacts there. I nodded along at the time, but in future interviews, other members weren't sure about that reasoning.

Christians than anything." Peter pointed out that there were many values that he held as a Christian that the broader society – even many fellow Christians – could be hostile to. "Initially, it's very accepting," he explained. "But once you get down to the controversial aspects of Christianity – that are true, things the Bible explicitly discusses – not Jesus being the way, the truth, and the light, but Christianity being the only true religion, and it's like, 'Whoa, that's not okay. You can't say that!'"

Instead of overt repression of their faith, the ministry's diagnosis identifies a colorless, thoughtless form of Christianity as the problem – what one speaker for Cru called "empty religion," likened to the endless prostrations in a Buddhist temple he had visited (which was "religiously powerful" and "humbling," but in his mind also revealed this flaw in people's religious thinking.) They see a nation full of people who, despite calling themselves Christians, live according to the secular values of American society, and mostly try to keep their heads down and follow the rules as long as it is convenient. Instead of being pinned by some devilish conspiracy or army of evil liberals, American Christians are complacently lying down, ignoring both the temporal and spiritual demands of their faith. These demands vary widely in how much they contrast with the values members would otherwise find on the campus, from "feed the poor and accept the alien" to "don't accept same-sex attraction as normal."

According to Erin, an undergrad with Cru, "I think a lot of what's become of peoples' view of Christianity is this very stiff religious rulebook that people follow. It's kind of – I think the heart of what the Christian faith is lost to the society viewpoint. If I were to tell a classmate I was a Christian, they probably would not view it as 'this person ultimately loves Jesus and wants His name to be made great. It would be more, you're a morally good person…because that's what you're told you have to do, not a transformation of a person."

One sermon at Cru broke this lifeless religion down into three essential components: 1) unwillingness to fight against sin in your life (the speaker said that for men, this was often lust, but he did not know what it would be for women.) 2) An individualistic view of Christianity where your own needs and priorities come first. And finally, 3) "cheap grace," the assumption that, because you are forgiven and identify as a Christian, you don't need to do anything more. (This does not make a person un-forgiven, but he urged us imagine it in human terms: apologizing to someone half-heartedly and then continuing to do the things that hurt them is a poor way to be.) A person following this stunted faith keeps Jesus in their "hip pocket," and builds their identity from other things, instead of making Him a central part of their identity. From this perspective, is full of people who would mark "Christian" in a demographic survey, but are still in desperate need of Jesus in their lives.

Sermons at InterVarsity meetings describe a similar dynamic, where prayer becomes a meaningless mental tic, church becomes a boring obligation, and the voice of God vanishes behind routine religion. A prayer workshop went into detail about how easy it is to forget that prayer is communication with a living, thinking being rather than a ritual that stays within the believer's own mind. Another night, a guest speaker told the story of a time when he failed to be a Good Samaritan, and ruefully commented that his PhD in Christian ethics hadn't amounted to much in that situation. No matter how technically learned a believer may become, no matter how they profess to follow Jesus, they can always slip back into rote ways of thinking and being.

However, InterVarsity does not tend to use other world religions as examples of doing it wrong. Are they trying to avoid the reaction that Peter described, and fit into an ethic of religious tolerance? As with the LGBT question, this may vary between leadership and members. In my interview with Alex, the local InterVarsity director, he was firm on the truth of Christianity as

opposed to other faiths, and the ministry does send out mission trips to spread their own type of Christianity, but the very first meeting I attended was an open mic night wherein one of the members got up in front to thank God for her Muslim friend who saved her from a terrifying roommate situation, and the story was enthusiastically received. Members of IVCF seem keenly aware that broadcasting disdain for LGBT people and those of other faiths can encourage Christians to hurtful behavior towards them, and so avoid it.

This could also be the reason that members of both ministries, and even outside speakers they bring in, usually stop short of directly stating their stance on LGBT issues, instead saying that they have a Biblical stance and letting listeners fill in. I asked members of both ministries what to make of this habit, but none were confident in their answers. However, one sermon in Cru straightforwardly said that same-sex desire was sinful and wrong, and for me, at least, it was a dash of cold water to the face. Avoiding that sensation makes meetings a lot more welcoming, and avoid throwing up barriers to new potential members. As LGBT issues figure heavily into a transformation that InterVarsity's framing underwent recently, chapter 4 will approach this question from another angle.

Finally, one aspect of InterVarsity's framing that is much less pronounced in Cru's is the possibility of *corporate sin*, or the idea that individuals can be culpable for the sins of groups they belong to if they also benefit from those sins, or can unthinkingly carry them forward. The idea is less to make members feel guilty than it is for members to take responsibility for mitigating problems that are bigger than their own human failings. (Crespo 2015) This is an important component of their framing because it allows them to approach problems of racial discrimination and privilege without leveling them as a direct accusation against white members.

Prognosis

This titanic diagnosis is more than a registered student organization should have to handle, and the first step to the ministries' prognosis is for members to recognize this and acknowledge that they are not facing it alone. The omnipotent God of the universe, standing above and apart from the world's brokenness, is acting with them and through them. Thus, while the problem starts at the cosmic level, the first step of the ministries' solution is personal. What should an individual enmeshed in a world of sin do? According to Cru, their only hope is to make the commitment to move away from a "self-directed life" towards a "Christ-directed life."

Cru's "Three Es," repeated for newcomers at the start of every large group meeting and bible study, form a brief summation of this prognostic frame. *Embracing the Gospel* refers to each individual's decision to accept the good news that Jesus has died for their sins and let it inspire them to follow Him. *Experiencing it Together* calls upon members to build a community together to support and aid each other in following Jesus. Finally, *Extending it to Others* puts the evangelism in evangelicalism. With the community as a support, they intend for members to strike out into the world and spread the word of the gospel and what it means. The second and third Es are guidelines for building members' individual commitments into broader social change, and will be the focus of this chapter's next sections.

InterVarsity speakers were less formulaic in the presentation of their prognostic frame, bringing in a wider variety of presentations in each meeting, but some meetings started with a bite-sized summation of their plan: "Students & Faculty Transformed, Campuses Renewed, & World Changers Developed." Counter to Cru's characterization of college as a landscape of temptation, InterVarsity sees the "mixing bowl of beliefs" on campus as a "Christian goldmine," teeming with ministries and opportunities to live out their faith. Temptation and risk are necessary, because

believers will face them in the world beyond college; members should get used to dealing with different kinds of people and professing their faith without fear "because that is what it takes to change the world: a generation of people willing to fervently act on a truth bigger than themselves." (Samudre 2013) This echoes Christian Smith's observation that evangelicalism thrives in environments where multiple creeds and ways of life are jostling for attention. (Smith 1998)

The inclusion of faculty in the first bullet-point is relevant; as of 2017, their faculty chapters claim 1,959 members, and they are looking to expand. According to their vision statement, "Over the next two decades, nearly two-thirds of all current professors will retire. This represents an unprecedented opportunity to increase the number of Christian faculty. One of our most significant strategies is to identify, prepare, and network graduate students who sense God's call to the professorate. May the Lord continue to use the Emerging Scholars Network — all 3,500 members — as a feeder system to bring missional believers into academic positions." (Hill 2010)

This carries through to members of GCF, who are generally more embedded in their various professional fields than the ministry itself. When I asked about what they wanted the ministry's help to do, all of my GCF interviewees an opportunity to carry a torch into other areas of their life. A GCF member named Kyle related his experiences across multiple ministries, finding himself in an odd "gray" area where he was a member of both a fraternity and Cru's Greek Life ministry, so fellow members didn't know whether he was ministering or part of the population being ministered to. This black and white conception, according to him, could drive people away from the faith, so he would want to model this "gray Christianity" in his professional life to help others see themselves as possible Christians as well. "The only big change I want to make in the world is to offer support, and just be there – I think, especially in Engineering, there aren't many Christians, or the fact that I still partake in the social life of the Greek system – that's what I want

to do." While he, like many of the GCF members I interviewed, felt that he didn't understand GCF's overall mission, we both learned in a later meeting that his aims were in line with GCF's aim to build a "para-academy" and show academia what it could be – not just a model of hard work and knowledge, but also compassion, justice, and faith.

Kyle also pointed out that his membership in GCF helped him passively by putting him in contact with colleagues and coworkers who are also Christians, offering the anecdote of a colleague seeing him snapchatting about being in a bible study and revealing that she attended one for a different ministry. "I never would have guessed, and I don't think she would've guessed for me," he explained. Even in a nation full of empty, thoughtless Christianity, fellow strong believers are out there, and a believer having membership in a ministry as an open part of their identity can help them to find others.

Cru was less overt about training the leaders of tomorrow, and put more emphasis on members either continuing with the ministry as an intern or staff, or finding new Christian communities wherever they go. They strongly encourage members a "home church" in addition, as members should have contact with a Christian community that is more stable than a campus ministry and includes more different types of people, particularly cross-generational contact. They are conscious of the fact that a member's time with Cru is likely to be a small part of their spiritual journey. However, the hope of sending members out to carry their values into positions of influence and leadership hovers in the background for them as well.

At one meeting of Cru, the front table offered copies of *A Cry of Hope, A Call to Action* by Charles Gilmer, president of a Cru ministry called the Impact Movement. While the Impact Movement serves Black students, his explanation for why they focus on college students holds true for Cru more generally. In short, college students are on the path to be leaders of their

community, and the Impact Movement supports them in living according to Biblical standards in this challenging and wildly tempting environment as they set habits that they will live by for the rest of their lives. According to Gilmer, this problem is particularly relevant to Black students, as spiritual leaders would focus so much on getting parishioners to college that they pay little attention to the gauntlet of temptations college life represents, and far too many look back on their college escapades with wry amusement. "We fail to appreciate the grace of God that kept us from the destruction with which we so cavalierly toyed." We will be spending more time with Gilmer in chapter 4, as the activities of the Impact Movement are a textbook case of frame bridging. (Gilmer 2009)

The devotion that the ministries demand is not simply adopting a label; with every lesson, meeting, and message, they are working towards a state of constant spiritual awareness, where Jesus is at least a factor in every decision and interaction. When I interviewed Mae and Ken, the co-leaders of the GCF bible study group I attended, the first thing they ended up talking about was habit formation. Mae was working a stressful job as a medical receptionist, dealing with vulnerable people having really bad days, and always seemed to catch herself when she was getting far too angry with patients and coworkers. Ken agreed that it was easy to be "a dick" without realizing it, until something tipped him of, and recommended reading Jamie Smith's *You Are What You Love* if I wanted to know more about the program of spiritual habit formation they were attempting. Their goal was to use this attention and focus to "recode" themselves at a basic level, and make kindness and gentleness their default response, instead of something they have to try and get back to when they realize they've messed it up.

"You notice throughout this entire conversation, we haven't brought up Jesus or God," Ken pointed out. "We've been talking about habit formation – love your neighbor, instead of love God

and love your neighbor." "None of that means anything without actually *doing* something," Mae replied. "So, I'm not sure that that's entirely a problem." The moment of introspection between them reveals a subtle point to the prognosis that would be easy to miss – while evangelism requires members to be overt about their faith, other forms of virtue do not, and members are generally comfortable talking about ethics and morals in reference to their practical effects in the world, trusting that good effects will be pleasing to God.

To summarize so far, the problem that Cru and InterVarsity identify is a world full of sin, suffering, and people half-heartedly playing at the faith they would need to fix it. Their solution is to introduce as many people as possible to the mental and spiritual tools they will need to maintain their faith and practice virtue, embed them in a supportive community, and eventually send them out as confident Christians who can continue to spread the word and brighten the world wherever they end up. This prognosis is a plan for the whole world, and for members' whole lives, not just the campus or their college years. But how can ministries convince members to take part in such an ambitious plan?

Motivation

Those familiar with conservative Christian movements beyond college might expect campus ministries to call members to a battle against cosmic evil for the soul of the nation. Instead, they mostly avoid the language of war and employ a multipronged motivational frame to help guide members down the many narrow, branching paths they might take. Emotion and reason are braided tightly in this framing, emphasized to varying degrees in different situations.

Foremost among the emotions evoked in the ministries' motivational framing are gratitude and awe. As we worked our way through Hebrews in Jed's bible study, he would periodically stop

to impress upon us the scale of the concepts we were grappling with, and the fact that this wondrous being cared about *us* personally. This theme was echoed in the InterVarsity prayer workshop – you are not in the backyard talking with a friend over beers, you are before the throne of the universe. According to the prayer that Cru recommends for dedicating one's self to Jesus, the whole journey starts with gratitude: "Lord Jesus, I need You. Thank You for dying on the cross for my sins. I open the door of my life and receive You as my Savior and Lord. Thank You for forgiving my sins and giving me eternal life. Take control of the throne of my life. Make me the kind of person You want me to be." (Cru FAQ 2018)

As their goal is to build a community where young Christians can feel accepted and supported, that very acceptance and support can draw members in and keep them active. Large group meetings are designed to be enjoyable, with music, spectacle, and sometimes games or even snacks. Having a fun time is not their main purpose, but it is an important part of the welcoming atmosphere they try to create. (Though Shae, one of the MCs for the 2016 year, remarked to me that now that Cru does games less, a lot of the students she talks to miss them.) Both ministries offer members a wide array of events throughout the semester, some directly related to the group's mission, and others just for fun. Dances, board game nights, volleyball games, movies, and more pop up over the course of the semester, sometimes aimed at subdivisions of members, most often women or men, and sometimes open to all.

The periodic conferences (such as NDCC, Freshman Getaway, Urbana, and so forth) are advertised in large group meetings as fun getaways to the point that I had dismissed them as a source of data until I learned from Jordan, a sophomore with Cru, that much of his deeper knowledge of their strategy and methods came from attending these conferences. Just as the regular large group meetings have to be tuned for the possibility that this is a listener's first visit

to the ministry, these events could be aimed at people who were more invested in the organization and are ready to take a deeper part in its workings. (There is also the matter of being willing to pay to take part, but both ministries offer scholarships and aid to help members with strained finances.) The conferences and mission trips are billed as potentially life-changing *experiences*, and InterVarsity can even connect you with study abroad opportunities to aid in your professional development at the same time.

Among all of my interviewees, formal and informal alike, only one came to their faith through a campus ministry, and it was indirectly (a Cru intern named Brett joined in undergrad because his brother became a Christian through Cru, and brought the lessons back on vacations.) All of the members I talked to came to college looking for a Christian community to plug into, and for members who are already drawn and driven by faith, the ministry offers valuable fellowship and instruction. Fellowship will be explored in a section below, but the promise of instruction is particularly important to the faithful because they already want to live according to the Bible, and neither ministry is made up of literalists who think the Bible is simple and obvious. They came feeling the call to action, and it falls to the ministries to help them figure out *what* action they're being called to. Chapter 5 will cover this process in more detail, but for now we can count unraveling the Bible as another point of appeal.

Another aspect of their prognostic framing was more prominently visible at Cru but present in both, and not often directly stated. Simply put, their frame holds that centering Jesus properly in one's life can grant believers higher perspective, helping them first to choose the right objectives to strive for, and equipping them to do so. Whatever difficulties you face, a commitment to follow Jesus can help. This is not to say that it will make their life easy – both ministries are careful to avoid prosperity gospel, the idea that God brings wealth and comfort to believers. (Some speakers

did argue that God would provide if you were doing His work, but were careful to add that a believer should not expect comfort, and that the aid would be *for* doing God's work.) Nevertheless, believers can hope for mental, social, and possibly even material benefits in addition to the spiritual. The section on frame extension at the end of this chapter will explore some of the implications of the frame's versatility.

Notably, this benefit does not depend on supernatural aid. The spiritual habits that Ken and Mae are working on building, for instance, works immediately to help them manage anger and conduct themselves in a more reasonable and gentle way. Following Jed's advice will help members to be patient with themselves and pace themselves in daily life. Members suffering from depression can find hope in Khan's assurances that their illness does not make them less worthy of love, and hopefully receive more patience and compassion from their fellows. Director Alex warned me against the spiritual dangers of "therapeutic moralistic theism," an understanding of religion that approaches it entirely from the perspective of what it can do to improve the individual's life, but as motivation for members, these possibilities are hard to ignore.

Each adherent is drawn by a different combination of these motivations, and find their way to different levels of engagement, from Jordan, who crams every free moment in his agricultural science program with activities from multiple ministries, to Drew, who was tentatively trying the bible study out at the end of my fieldwork. This variety of motivating emotions and reasons is cultivated to cast a wide net and avoid driving fickle college students away. This is one reason that, while it is an acknowledged and important part of the theology of both ministries (Strider 2018, IVCF C 2018), the concept of Hell almost never comes up. In all of the meetings I attended, it was mentioned twice, both times as an aside to a larger point. Just as they avoid overtly stirring up fear or disdain towards members of other faiths, they also shy from motivating members with

fear. God's wrath is not absent – Cru could hardly do a sermon series on Jesus's letters to the seven churches in the book of *Revelation* and avoid it – but it is not a constant, recurring theme. In the average meeting, both Cru and InterVarsity will have a lot more to say about God's love and mercy.[4]

This means that the central appeal, the call to action that campus ministries raise, is not a battle of good against evil, but rather an effort to build, heal, and spread. While the ministries may describe people as misguided, "ill," or hurting, they do not have villains to rally against, and even their acknowledgment of "factions seek[ing] to undermine our witness on campus" (Govier 2014) are brief and unemotional. The broken world we live in is just a fact of life. Not even Satan gets much attention as an antagonist – and in the rare cases he is mentioned, it is usually as a warning to avoid giving him power by our actions; they do not want members to focus on a cosmic adversary when the enemy is within all of us.

In this view, the brokenness of the world is something that everyone must struggle through, more like an environmental hazard than a worldly conspiracy we can defeat. Spiritual warfare exists for both ministries, but articles from both (Larson 2015, Bright 2018) characterize their foes as Satan and "the world system," or as, Larson puts it, "leveraging of everything that God promises against everything that opposes God's purposes." Cru writers seem more open to the idea of looking for demonic influence in the world, but InterVarsity dismisses focusing on cosmic warfare as "black-belt level bonkersness." This poses a challenge to the ministries' motivational framing; despite their focus on emotion and human connection, their lack of tangible antagonists means that they cannot rely on "hot cognitions" to motivate their members. (Gamson 1995) Who is

[4] My insider's perspective is likely skewing my perceptions on this point. I am reminded of the time I attended a Catholic wedding with a colleague from Malaysia and he remarked on how morbid everything seemed. As someone who was driven away from the faith by fire and brimstone, I appreciated this approach, but recognize that it can hide darker currents.

responsible for the problem Cru now addresses? "Adam and Eve" is not a practical answer, and Satan doesn't care about our spite.

Sometimes, particularly in InterVarsity, this is coupled with a sociological imagination, as members are urged to take on broader perspectives, such as in Michelle Hayden's sermon on how the church should respond to racial (and other) injustice, or Khang's meditation on the gift of culture and the problems it can present to people within it. Mission trips are also hailed as broadening experiences, and members are reminded they have much to learn from the people they are evangelizing to. Viewed this way, the 'broken world' is a way to encourage "cold cognitions," and temper the judgments and frustrations that can flare up within a person of faith in an increasingly secular world. Much like a sociology instructor in an individualistic society like the US can find themselves emphasizing structure over agency because they can count on their students to lean too hard on agency, perhaps the ministries' messaging is designed to emphasize universal sin, unjust systems, and compassion for imperfection because they judge our society to have enough blame, rage, and acrimony. (After the 2016 election, both ministries ran articles about the difficulty of loving people with different political stances, for instance.) The hot cognitions will come; the ministries' task is to help channel them productively.

Another potentially surprising absence is the end of days, as it figures so heavily into evangelical theology. (Sutton 2014) This is a widespread – but not universal – belief that the Bible predicts that Jesus will someday descend from heaven, end the world in its current form, pass judgment on the living and the dead, and usher in a new era of peace and justice in a new world that is the best of Heaven and Earth, though there are theological disputes over the nature of the ending, the timing of the various steps, and so forth. While most members believe that Jesus will return (Ken was one exception), neither of ministry were ever preoccupied with the idea that

history would someday end. Tim Lahaye of *Left Behind* fame was once a member of Campus Crusade, but his focus on the End was a source of friction for him, and he was also part of a current within the ministry that Bright felt was too focused on "culture wars stuff" rather than evangelism. He would only become famous after leaving. (Turner 2008) The fear and anticipation of Jesus's return simply do not factor majorly into Cru or InterVarsity's motivational frame. One of the few online articles I could find that presaged the return of Jesus explained how Cru expects members to be looking forward to this event: Christians put their finest efforts and play hard, as though these were the last minutes of the game. (Cru Comm 2018)

Apart from appealing to potential adherents, this focus on positive emotions is important for the actions that it inspires in members. When I walked around with a senior member of Cru named Liam during the unfortunately named *Storm the Quad* event, he advised me that we didn't want to be like "Pastor Bob," who comes out to the quad to preach at everyone that they are going to Hell and unfailingly gathers a circle of hecklers. Similarly, as Peter noted above, Christians have historically been atrocious in their treatment of LGBT people, and this is just one of many issues that members of both ministries would readily agree to having fallen short on. (Another example: Dale, the local director of Cru, mentioned that he had noticed how predominantly white Cru meetings were, and was hoping to get a local chapter of the Impact Movement started.) Fostering an outlook that encourages open, friendly ways of interacting with others is an earnest attempt to live up to their values, and beyond that is also good marketing.

Feeling the right emotions is not all that matters, of course. The following sections will outline some of the procedures and activities that members of both use to carry out those second two "Es" – proselytizing to the community, and building a Christian community together.

Spreading the Word

This section begins the exploration of how both Cru and InterVarsity carry out their prognosis and try to reach the students of this campus. However, while they are also an important part of the prognostic framing of both ministries, mission trips to other nations will be covered in the next chapter from the perspective of frame bridging.

Outreach through Large Group Meetings

"I'm not sure how much I'm meant to get out of large group meetings," Shae told me. "I think large-group is a great way to – even now, as a Junior – a great time to serve others." According to her, the large-group meetings are primarily for outreach, and the MCs' job is to create a welcoming, engaging environment by making attendees feel, "welcome, known, loved, heard, seen – I just came up with some of those." This is why every Cru meeting starts with a description of their "Three Es," and an honest effort to get listeners up to speed on the basic goal and methods of Cru, and what the gospel is in their view. This was not a recitation, but each speaker (usually, but not always, one of the MCs) explaining in their own words, on the spot. (This echoes the prayers at the ends of large and small group meetings, which are also extemporaneous.) Both ministries make a visible effort to make their presentations approachable to outsiders, explaining terms, striking a gentle, positive tone, and keeping things short.

A point that surprised me was that staffers and invested members at Cru scan for people awkwardly standing alone and eagerly draw them into discussion or just sit with them during the service; once or twice, I was startled to be sighted from a distance and have a staffer zoom up on me. Early my fieldwork, I brought a colleague along to see if I would be approached less, but we discovered that we looked like a couple, and got a greater variety of members talking to us. Once

I had joined Jed's bible study, they started inviting me to sit with them, which changed the feeling of meetings even though we didn't interact much during them. I did not experience anything similar at InterVarsity, though on the open-mic night we were divided into café-style tables to break the ice and get to know each other. Until I was ready to strike out and start talking to other members, they left me contentedly hovering in the Loft's dim lighting.

One outreach tool that InterVarsity avails itself of far more than Cru is the altar call. Evangelicalism is defined by members seeking a personal relationship with Jesus, and the altar call is an invitation for anyone who to come up to the altar (though the Loft lacks an altar, making the ceremonial aspect more decentralized) and formally commit to that relationship, or recommit themselves to that relationship. InterVarsity's small, homey space and means are well suited to presenting an altar call, with the dim light offering a sense of intimacy without scrutiny, the worship team picking out a soft, mellow tune, and the MC intoning the invitation to come forward in an earnest tone. Even if you are not intending to commit or recommit, the atmosphere becomes very emotional, hitting cues much like a film adding a gaussian blur and touching music. These effects can combine to create pressure that feels like it wells up from within, rather than bearing in on the attendee from others.

The activities of the worship teams (the bands that supplied music for members to sing to) were the most overtly and directly active in shaping the emotional experience of members; as we will see below, other aspects of the meetings' presentation were less controlled in this way. It is also important to remember Peterson's (2006) insight about how emotions can be shaped by an individual's interpretation of physical cues. My individual response to the altar call was shaped by a youth spent among various flavors of Christianity. I had been primed to associate the feelings that soft music, warm light, and being surrounded by quiet fellow-travelers with wanting to open

up to someone who will understand my burdens and mistakes. My interpretation may well hold true for many believers, but people with backgrounds more distant from evangelicalism might not read them the same way. In the course of my research, I did not meet any new converts to ask them what they thought of the altar calls.

When they were rivals, these ministries would snipe at each other by implying that their conversion numbers merely represented "repeat customers," and that they were not truly bringing new people into the fold. Now that they are on friendly terms, I have not heard any concern about this possibility. Sitting in ARC room 6 or the Loft, I have no way of knowing whether the people filtering forward are committing or recommitting themselves to Jesus, and the distinction may not be important.

As an essential part of Cru and InterVarsity's diagnostic frame is a wide gulf between claiming Christianity by default or out of habit and being a true, devoted Christian. In the ministries' view, calling back people who were wavering or sliding is just as important – particularly as the large-group's outreach is into a predominantly Christian country! The altar call can thus be a centering or anchoring experience for current members, and need not be fully aimed at newcomers.

While InterVarsity's late Friday night meetings might not come at an appealing time for the socially-minded undergrad, both ministries use their large group meetings as a tool for outreach. The meetings are easy to seek out, easy to invite people to, and always there.

Outreach through Events

Another common genre of activity is more involved with service; spreading the word or raising funds by helping or reaching out to people outside of their community. InterVarsity had

us doing yard work for old folks in exchange for donations, or handing out water to people hitting campus town on Friday nights. Cru also holds events like "Storm the Quad," where we broke into pairs and (gently, unobtrusively) proselytized to people who expressed interest to talking to us on a warm spring day on the quad. One of the event leaders, Liam, took me along. Between visits, I expressed surprise that so many people were hearing us out, and Liam told me that most people are willing to have a conversation with someone offering something new, especially because we were being careful to pick out people who looked ready for a conversation. (Also, people of the same sex as each pair – "We're here to convert, not flirt!" one member said, before we set out.)

Liam led us on a veering course behind the student union, avoiding people studying, listening to headphones, or just looking intense, before settling on a young man reclining in the grass with a book. He turned out to be a drama major, and was happy to have a chat. He listened politely to Liam's explanation of Cru's goals, asked questions, and got me into a discussion about omnipotence and CS Lewis, which seemed to please my partner. We left him with pamphlets depicting Jesus bridging the chasm of sin between Man and God, practically unchanged from Bill Bright's old design. We did not have any way to follow up with the people we talked to, or track if they came to Cru, but that was deliberate to avoid putting pressure on them. In an hour, Liam and I talked to three different people and bounced off of two more, one who was busy and one who was already involved in a ministry. This was the only event of this type I attended; asking around at the debrief, I found that our outcome was about average, though a team of young women from FAR had had a great run.

Campus ministries also get in on campus-wide RSO events, most notably Quad Day. In conversations before and after large group meetings, I discovered that many members had found their way to the ministry through the table they set up on Quad Day. An essential tool for the

members staffing that table are "comment cards," which students fill out to signal are open to emails, texts, or even a pair of members coming by your dorm room to see how they're doing. A common activity for "disciplers," (mentors in a program outlined below) is following up on those comment cards to see if the people who filled them out are interested in coming to a meeting, or hearing more about the good news.

Finally, the big conferences are offered as opportunities to invite friends who are fellow Christians but not as invested in the ministries. After one large group meeting in InterVarsity, the MCs put on a goofy skit showing the right way and the wrong way to invite friends, mainly advising us to avoid badgering or cajoling our friends however excited we may be. Very few of my interviewees had ever attended one of these conferences, but Jordan's comments led me to believe that they do not see many newcomers.

Cru and InterVarsity use a variety of events to build bonds within their community and create opportunities to expand it. With competition like Pastor Bob, they take these opportunities to cast themselves as a fun, helpful, and inviting presence on campus, trying to encourage even those who don't join to at least think well of them and consider what they have to say. While one could not say that they repress their identities in the way that members of an oppressed group might have to (Bernstein 1997), the quiet, unobtrusive way we "stormed" the quad suggests that a more restrained presentation of their faith is more productive.

Outreach through Bible Studies

Both ministries have a range of available groups, which was not immediately apparent upon my entry – at Cru, a member, later staffer, named Ray just invited me to a group for young men, without my seeing the machinery. As for InterVarsity, I sought out a bible study through

their website, and it was months before I realized that their graduate ministry was technically a separate entity, and my realization surprised one of the group leaders, who didn't even remember that he was affiliated with InterVarsity. For the most part, I stayed in close contact with the groups that I was invited to, learning about the others through interviews and online materials. Members of both the graduate and undergrad ministries of InterVarsity would later comment to me that the "marketing" for these small groups is not terrific, and that most people find their way to them through the large groups, without ever learning what groups are available.

While GCF bible study meetings started with warm greetings to newcomers, and Cru meetings always included their 3 Es to get visitors up to speed, they do not seem to be a major means of outreach. Additionally, all of Cru's bible studies and most of InterVarsity's take place in residence halls, behind locked doors. If you don't have an "in" or don't live in that community, they can be tricky (and a little shady) to find your way to. They do serve as a "next step" to draw members who have started to attend the large group meetings, as I found when guys from the Presby Hall group would start catching up with me after large group meetings, and a site for more focused and detailed instruction.

A Christian Community

In both large group meetings and bible studies, both ministries emphasized that the organizations themselves were secondary to the community built through their activities. This section focuses on the community-building aspects of the large and small group meetings; chapter 5 will delve into their instruction methods and content in greater detail.

Fellowship

"I love going {to large-group meetings}," Prudence, a Cru intern who leads a bible study group, told me. "Because I love looking around and seeing all the faces of people I love, and people that are there to worship…I love getting re-focused on Jesus, and how glorious He is, and just remembering that my life is eternal."

First, and most simply, the large group meetings are a chance for members to catch up with one another – a time on Thursday or Friday nights that they have set aside so that, however busy they are, they can be sure to see their friends, colleagues, and fellow worshipers. Whenever a meeting at either ministry ends, the room explodes with conversation, with members seeking each other out and moving from circle to circle. The catch-up-conversation is a delicate art, and when I got to know people enough that there were members wanting to catch up with me, I had to learn to open up quickly and break cleanly, as the busiest of my contacts would be making the most of these few minutes before everyone scatters over the campus again, darting from circle to circle.

The meetings are also a place to make deeper connections with co-religionists outside of your bible study group, across gender and age lines in particular. After reconfirming with me that the interview was indeed anonymous, Brett admitted that one other reason for attending the large groups was to improve his dating prospects. "I'm not gonna go pick up drunk chicks at a bar-that's not me," he told me. "At Cru there's a lot of women who share a similar faith, and want to grow in that faith, and want to share it…some of the other bible studies I've been to, there just weren't a lot of women." Meeting your future spouse through the ministry is a running joke among members of Cru, and it seems to be borne out for many of the senior staff and long-term members, including two of my interviewees. ("We are one of those, unfortunately," Peter admitted, when I asked, and then he laughed.) Judging from the range of people I have heard referring to this pattern

over my year with Cru, I suspect that this strategy for finding love is not limited to men, but that men were more inclined to confide it in a male interviewer. However, I have not encountered anything similar among members of InterVarsity.

The community can also pull together in times of crisis or tragedy. Recently, Dale's 11-year-old son passed away. The large-group meeting was going to be about mission trips, but after a general outcry, it became a prayer meeting for his family. Lifting one another up in prayer is a common sight in the small group meetings, but it becomes a much more striking experience when the whole community gathers and focuses their support. Jordan, an attendee of this meeting, told me that while the purpose of the ministries was not to be a refuge from the world, they could do so in extreme cases like this.

We can see how powerful this bonding experience is by comparing the outlooks of Cru members to the members of the GCF. When I started attending in 2016, GCF was small and highly decentralized – none of the members I met attended InterVarsity's large group meetings, regarding them as being for undergraduates, and only a few would regularly attend the monthly GCF events, which most commonly took the form of a potluck hosted by a member, sometimes with a speaker. Our disconnection from the main body was such that on two occasions I reminded Ken, one of the study group's leaders, that we were indeed associated with InterVarsity.

When I visited the Cru bible study in the year following fieldwork, I was surprised to discover that a graduate study group had sprung up in my absence. We had tried to create a graduate chapter in the previous year, but it had been impossible to coordinate schedules; the solution turned out to be letting those grad students who had found their way to the regular bible studies have their own subgroup. Talking with them after we had finished studying a chapter in *Acts*, I discovered that half of the six-member group was made up of former GCF members who

had come over to Cru for the greater sense of community and connection with believers of other ages and interests.

Discipleship

This is an important feature of membership in Cru, though it seems that, being smaller and more personal in general, GCF lacks a direct equivalent. Discipleship was opaque to me coming in – I only learned about it through interviews late in my fieldwork, and so heard the most about how it is carried out in Cru. (Revealing myself as a researcher from the outset likely took me out of consideration for people who would have taken me on for discipleship.)

For a member of Cru, "disciple" is a verb. Experienced members and staff take on younger members in a mentor/mentee relationship, meeting regularly to discuss various theological and ethical issues in depth. I am calling them "mentees" instead of "disciples" here because both members are supposed to be disciples of Jesus together, and turning the word into a verb removes the mentors from a position of veneration – the website does call them disciples, but I never heard a member refer to "my disciple," so calling them disciples here may give a misleading impression. Online Cru offers extensive resources for mentees and disciplers, including gentle methods for evangelism, outlines of problems that different groups are likely to face, outlines of common problems mentees might be facing, recommendations for Christian fundamentals, advice on choosing mentees, and more. (Cru 2018 D) However, the curriculum is not absolute, and does not lay out a program that all disciples follow – as long as disciplers cover the essentials, they are encouraged to develop their own relationships with mentees and even "wing" meetings if it fits their style.

"I love it, yeah," a staffer named Peter said of discipleship. "Meeting up with guys, getting to know them, helping them, answering questions…I talk to them, get to know what's going on in their lives. I want it to be something that they're looking forward to going to, so I want to have things prepared on topics that they're actually interested in talking about, or actually studying." In addition to instruction (or really sharing, as a few interviewees put it, deemphasizing the hierarchical aspect), mentors and mentees engage in witnessing work, the most recent case then being a series of dorm visits where they followed up on "comment cards" that interested students left at Cru's quad day table. Peter's description evoked my "ride-along" in the *Storm the Quad* event. If I were a mentee, I might have continued working with Liam, and eventually become confident enough to start showing a new member the ropes.

In discipleship, the strengths of the small group meetings are magnified even further, creating a deeply personal and personalized experience that allows members to explore aspects of their faith that they find interesting or fulfilling in great depth. To give an idea of the time commitment for staff members and interns, Prudence would meet with each of the six girls who she disciples for about two hours every week, "Reading the Bible together, praying together, and yeah, understanding more of who they are, and who God has created them to be…We're all created to glorify God, but that's why we're all so different – personalities, backgrounds, everything."

Discipleship also offers a way for members to take responsibility for helping fellow members without moving up some kind of hierarchy or expected progression. As Shae pointed out to me, not every member wants to become a bible study leader, and Cru has been taking steps towards allowing more involvement for people who don't. Discussing the future of the ministry, she said, "Everyone has different spiritual gifts, and I think it would be really cool to tap into some

more of those. Maybe art. God gave us all different talents, and we should be able to use them in different ways."

The Limits of Fellowship

Building a safe and functional community sometimes means pushing members out. The directors of both InterVarsity and Cru told me that, rarely, they have to ask members to leave over manipulative or toxic behavior that endangers the ability of other members to feel safe or grow in their faith. Of the other interviewees, only one other, Peter, easily recalled a case of a member being ejected. Some time ago, before he had joined as an intern, a young man in the membership had a habit of talking to women in a way that made them very uncomfortable. "Everyone belongs, but…" Peter said, shaking his head, and trailed off. "But you can't be doing that," I volunteered, and he nodded. Meanwhile, Director Dale, remarked the convivial relationships between the various ministries on campus works to their advantage in that they can warn one another about people who engage in toxic behavior, as they will likely seek out other ministries.

That is not the only reason that members can be pushed out for, however. Lisette is a former member of InterVarsity who was asked to leave, and encountered me outside the context of the ministry itself. Her tale is unusual in that part of IVCF's reasoning for her censure was theological. During a particularly brutal semester as a biology major, Lisette found that she couldn't make it to any of the regularly scheduled InterVarsity events, and so got together with a group of her fellow students to found their own bible study. However, at the time, she was interested in theology that ran counter to IVCF's statement of faith. From the perspective of the ministry, then, her group was starting to look like a heterodox splinter-sect that could dilute their message and potentially confuse members (or their "brand," as Lisette characterized it.) In

response, they asked her to dissolve her group, her only means of participating in IVCF, which amounted to ejecting her.

Despite all of this, she insists that InterVarsity is not the villain of her story; looking back, she says that she was in strange theological waters then, and IVCF had good reasons for wanting to break up her small group. (She did not specify what the "weird stuff" she was into was, and I did not press.) She even attended a large group meeting or two after her group was dissolved, and made up with the members who decided her case, but did not remain a member or stay in contact. "I think that the kinds of relationships that you make in those ministries are based on convenience," Lisette told me as we walked away from the interview. "Once you aren't at meetings every week together, you drift apart."

Drake, a member of GCF, would agree with that assessment. "We're not a friendship group, I would argue. GCF doesn't have a greater sense of community; there are the four bible study groups that meet, what, once a week, and talk about God, and don't really have a relationship outside of that." This may be a consequence of GCF being particularly atomized, however, as interviewees from Cru all agreed that members were likely to stay in contact with the friends they made in the ministry after graduating, and some of the staff had friends who had. (These findings could be skewed by the fact that everybody who I talked to was either currently in school as a member of Cru, or was invested enough in it to sign on as an intern or three-year staff.) Indeed, staff members have to raise their own salaries by getting support from former members and other donors, which implies that a strong network remains even for those who don't stay on as staff. This even enables some continuity between "cohorts" of staff, as I learned from Prudence that she met many of her supporters, many of whom were members from before her time, for the first time

through this network. Staffers can be reached for update letters and donations through a website maintained by Cru. (Berkey 2018)

If the ministries succeed in building the kind of fellowship they aim to, members will build bonds that will last beyond college, whether or not they remain attached to Cru. And, as interviewee after interviewee has emphasized, the organization itself is unimportant – it is just a vehicle, no greater or lesser than any one of dozens of other ministries or churches out there. The greater importance lies with their faith, and their ability to find, contribute to, or even found mutually supportive Christian communities.

Political Persuasion?

Sociologist Lydia Bean found that the close association between evangelical Christianity and conservative politics is maintained in churches by lay opinion leaders, members who are not invested with any formal authority, but set the tone of gatherings and move their less politically-minded fellows to link conservative and evangelical identities (Bean 2014). There have only been limited explorations of political attitudes of campus ministry members, though membership has been found to correlate with opposition to same-sex marriage (Todd et al. 2016), so I was on the lookout for members filling the role of opinion leaders here. However, over my time with both ministries, I saw only faint connections between the ministry's frame of evangelism and growth and the conservative political stances of most of my interviewees, and only for very specific issues.

Sermons rarely touched on political issues, and almost completely eschewed political prescriptions, which is consistent with Bean's findings. The sermon with the most overtly political statement I encountered in my fieldwork was not from either ministry, but from the Reverend Charlie Dates of the Progressive Baptist Church, who spoke at the All Campus Worship in 2017.

(The ACW is an event that connects many of the ministries on campus. It will be covered in more detail in chapter 4.) During his sermon, he recounted meeting with the mayor of Chicago at the PBC, and discussing "certain legislation" before the mayor was to speak to the congregation. He gently advised the mayor not to "push his agenda" upstairs, because it won't work. "What does it matter who loves who?" the mayor had asked him, and he used this story as a springboard into a sermon about how God is love (but love is not God), and so love is not subject to humans' "whimsical, frivolous, and carnal" redefinitions. Much like the members of both ministries, though, he did not directly state what these redefinitions were. (From the anecdotes and concerns he shared, the list of "redefinitions" was clearly not limited to including same-sex attraction, but they were what stood out most clearly.)

Bible study groups and other small gatherings would be the small place for opinion leaders to do their work, but in all the meetings I attended, I only really encountered one person who seemed to be slipping into the role; GCF study leader Ken was not shy about his political leanings (he and Mae voted for Hillary), and when the then-upcoming election came up in conversation, the general tone seemed to follow them leftward. We met on the day of the election, and Ken half-jokingly proposed opening a bottle of Jack Daniels and watching the results instead of having the normal bible study. It was a worried meeting. In subsequent interviews, however, I discovered that members didn't feel any particular pressure from these discussions, and went on contentedly attending and holding their own political stances. (However, I do not think that someone whose identity was invested in supporting Trump would have felt welcome in that group, due to the way we talked about him.)

Notably, despite the nationwide correlation between evangelicalism and support for President Trump (Gorski 2017), none of the members of either ministry I talked to, formally or

informally, expressed any fondness for the president. When asked about the recent election, responses ranged from Graham dismissing it as a "shitshow," to the conservative Beth lamenting that *these* were the two people we had to choose between, to Lisette chuckling softly and replying, "I'll say democracy's not the best system, and leave it at that." The closest thing to support I could find was from Jordan, who was frustrated with the continuing protests and wanted everyone to quit whining and get on with things.

Of the interviewees, I found that Cru members were consistently conservative, though they varied in the degree to which they thought their conservative convictions ought to be enforced, mostly tending towards ceding the government to secularism. As Prudence, a Cru staffer, said of same-sex marriage, "If they're not Christians and they want to get married, they're saying that they're not Christian, so why should we make them abide by Christian rules?"[5] Meanwhile, members of InterVarsity and particularly GCF had a range of political leanings, from left to right, though even the more conservative graduate ministry members were mostly unbothered by LGBT people and in favor of marriage equality. "If it makes them happy," Kyle said simply, "Do it."

The director of InterVarsity, Alex, put the political difference between the ministries down to demographics, pointing out that Cru is more predominantly white while InterVarsity has far more people of color. Given the specific bible study groups I was involved with, both largely white, I suspect that there are other reasons at work. As noted above, InterVarsity binds its Christian frame tightly to its concern for social issues, such as racism and poverty. Their attention to these issues is one of the main things that marks them to members of other ministries, and these issues have been coded as left-wing in American politics. Meanwhile, GCF, floating apart from

[5] Her answer was more nuanced than this, indicating that while she thought that, in God's perfect world, all children would need (and get) both a mother and a father, but in this sinful world, there are broken families all over and any given mother or father might not be filling their role anyway, so it isn't a strong argument against.

its home ministry and serving adults with more fully formed opinions as a way to spend a Tuesday night, rather than an identity to take on, just sees members of different political persuasions sharing a space without pushing on one another.

Similar to the large group meetings, in terms of curriculum, neither of the ministries spent much time on politics at all. The hands-off stance I observed in the large group meetings and online materials held true in these meetings as well, and that much is consistent with Bean's findings. No interviewee felt that they got a lot of their political views or information through the ministry, but it is worth noting that both ministries encourage members to have "home churches," where they may be encountering the currents Bean revealed. As the ministries are made up of a narrow band of ages and somewhat constricted in terms of interest and social class, they want members to have access to faith communities drawing from more different types of people.

Overall, the range of responses from interviewees, even the most conservative, suggest that the articulation of conservative politics and evangelical Christianity that I had taken for granted going in may not be as strong here. While multiple Cru members characterized their opposition to marriage equality as "believing in the Bible," beyond LGBT issues and abortion, they would tend to describe their stances in reference to other standards, rather than religious. For example, as the topic of our interview shifted to politics, Brett commented, "Because I don't stake my identity on politics, I think I can view them a little more objectively." When I directly asked if greed in modern capitalism could be squared with Christianity, his response was utilitarian – he acknowledged the greed and, rather than casting it as a virtue in itself, argued that it could be harnessed to help more people than the ideals of well-meaning planners. These findings are consistent with my interviews with both local directors, who had no desire to see their ministries become partisan organizations. Director Alex remarked to me that his privilege as a white man

made it so that he could elect to ignore politics if he wanted, but that his faith demands he stay involved no matter how frustrating and draining it can be. However, both he and Director Dale declined to share their political views with me.

I found myself bringing politics into Cru once or twice, as I was following a variety of traumatic news stories in the wake of the 2016 election, and they were what usually came to mind when everyone would be asked for prayer concerns. When we were gathered in prayer, I and a few other members introduced the group leader to the water protectors of Standing Rock, and the stir over the Muslim student who had a knife pulled on her on one of our busses. This could be read by an observer as an attempt on my part at articulation, trying to weave the causes I was anxious about into the activities of the movement. However, I do not think that this vaulted me to the status of "opinion leader," as many members were already familiar, and the water protectors were just slotted into the list of people we prayed for.

While both ministries encourage political participation, particularly getting members to vote, they do not dictate the form or direction that participation should take. Apart from InterVarsity's concern for racial injustice, abortion and LGBT rights were the only politicized issues that got consistent attention in sermons, and the stances on them were not uniform among members of either ministry. One could characterize the membership of Cru as generally conservative, and argue that InterVarsity's membership tends leftward from there, but they do not regard these political inclinations as part of their mission, and none of my interviewees found that they were getting their views on politics from the ministries. Cru and IVCF's official approach to politics is shaped by the imperative to be open and welcoming, and their internal political cultures strike a balance between the broader world of evangelical culture, their embeddedness in academia, and possibly the Beanian opinion leaders that members encounter at their home churches.

Guiding Emotions

As noted in chapter 1 with Jasper (2011), social movement literature has frequently neglected the importance of emotion as a means to emphasize the rational nature of social movement action. The sophisticated work that the ministries do with emotions demonstrates Jasper's point that rationality and emotion are a false dichotomy when considering social movements, because they are interwoven within every one of the framing tasks above. However, the emotional work done here is not a matter of how ideas are presented in writing or in meetings; when I asked leaders in both ministries how they managed the emotional tone of their meetings, the question seemed to wrong-foot them. The emotional arc of a meeting does not loom large in their planning, both because they value authenticity on the part of speakers, and because the meetings are not tightly planned between the various actors responsible for them. Frequently, the MCs will not even know the exact content of the sermons they are leading into. More important to them than the presentation and pageantry within the meetings is the emotional work that they encourage members to undertake on their own time, in their own lives.

Jasper's typology of emotions can be helpful in understanding some of the descriptions above – in short, many works on emotions in social movements have made the mistake of conflating these three categories, treating all of them as though they were reflex emotions. Urges are physical impulses and desires (e.g. lust, hunger, needing to use the restroom), reflex emotions are responses to immediate circumstances, and moods are longer-term dispositions that color interactions, thoughts, and decisions over a long period of time. Efforts to manage and direct these different types of emotion are consistent across many types of movement – urges are to be disciplined, reflex emotions are to be interpreted and acted upon according to the movement's

goals, and moods are to be cultivated that will avoid either paralysis or apathy. The ministries may offer a slight wrinkle as compared to other movements, though.

Kevin and Mae's endeavor to "reprogram" their responses to the everyday stressors illustrates this distinction, as they are trying to deliberately cultivate a mood that will change the reflex emotions that they experience when encountering frustrating situations – or at least the response that they show to others. This is an example of the intended functioning of the ministries' prognostic frame – to create in members a disposition that will make them approach everyday problems in a Christian (forgiving, kind, upright, et cetera) fashion. These endeavors do not always spring directly from the ministries' teachings, but they encourage members to take up such programs of self-improvement, supply suggestions and guidance for what a Christian outlook should be, and provide a supportive environment for members to feel their positions out and figure out how to improve them. This is a significant point of difference from SMOs where the work with emotions is intended to encourage some concrete political action – voting a particular way, protesting, making demands of authority figures – is that in this case, the moods thus created are an end in themselves. It is not a specific action that members are called upon to undertake; rather, members are called upon to carry out whatever they do in life in a way that would make Jesus happy. The strange consequences of the breadth of these frames are outlined in the next section.

Jasper's concept of a "moral battery," where action is motivated and sustained by contrasting positive and negative emotion, can give us an alternative to the Gamsonian approach I took in considering the ministries' relationship to their "adversaries" above. When this concept has been deployed in other movements, the poles are often located in allies and adversaries, such as the pride of LGBT communities against the shame imposed by oppressors (Bernstein 1997), or the legitimate power of the masses against the unjust manipulations of the elite (Jasper 2014). In

a sense, the poles of the moral battery must both exist in everyone who we meet – no human is worthy of adulation, but none should be reviled – and so believers watch one another carefully for signs of sliding, but always stand ready to support them. It also mediates the alienation of same-sex attraction above by encouraging members to view the problematic identities and attractions of themselves and others as part of this essential division through all humans; no other sin should cause a member to revile a person, so nor should this. However, as noted, this very likely does not have the intended effect for potential LGBT members.

Boundless Frame Extension

Frame extension is a process whereby a social movement organization "extends the boundaries of its frame to encompass interests or points of view that are incidental to its primary objectives, but of considerable salience to potential adherents." (Benford and Snow 1986) Campus ministries are engaged in a ravenous campaign of frame extension, bringing a variety of issues into the purview of their faith. While there are many areas of human endeavor that the movement architects have not considered, they hold that nothing is incidental to God.

As noted above, while they always take on an evangelical lens, sermons cover many different subjects. The first InterVarsity sermon series I attended was called, "What does the Bible say about…?", introducing an array of tough topics and giving a Christian perspective on them. A more recent Cru series was "Running the race," where staff members reveal sins that they personally struggle with, and how the audience can work on dealing with similar issues they may face. The wide net that ministries cast is more than a cynical marketing ploy (though marketing remains a concern) – as Jesus's aid is the answer to any issue a member could be facing, they want to work to extend it to as many different members as they can, meeting them all where they are.

Online, Cru offers advice and aid for dealing with toxic masculinity (Kemp 2014), unemployment (McCall 2018), anxiety disorders (Tripp 2018), racism (Arnold 2016), training to be a healthcare professional (Cru E 2018), and countless other topics. Similarly, InterVarsity's website can tell readers about sports fandom culture (McCarty 2017), HIV/AIDS (IVCF B 2006), sexual assault (Ziegler 2017), chronic illness (McReynolds 2015), sleep deprivation (Bullis 2013) and more – and this is without considering the vast output of InterVarsity Press. The top pages showcase articles that concern topics members are likely to be concerned with, from recent tragedies in the news to posts on managing multiple competing obligations in late August as the school year starts to gear up. The ministries want to help members with everything they can – or rather, as the MC emphasized in Cru's mission trip meeting, serve as conduit and catalyst for God to help them.

Another venue for frame extension is lifting up concerns in prayer. Whatever worries a member, or whatever they think the ministry should be worrying about, this is their chance to bring it up, and other members can signal what they think. This does not extend the frame in the sense that members will learn a detailed explanation of the ministry's stance on the topic, particularly if it is a topic that has just sprung up. When he learned about the plight of the water protectors, Jed just agreed, "That *is* bad," and added them to the prayer. If I were an anxious believer, though, this would likely have been sufficient; the absence of an argument or stern instruction about my concerns would assure me that I was not going astray and fellow members of my faith found such issues worthy of concern as well.

While the framing outlined in this chapter is rooted in propositions of eternal truth and invariance, it is highly versatile and open to extension. The framing starts with the individual adherent and doesn't depend on churches or ministries as formal institutions, meaning that anyone

could theoretically take it up and adapt it to their circumstances. It derives its values from a being that it claims to be beyond any context we could possibly find ourselves in, and yet also holds that God deeply cares about our circumstances and experience. Finally, it claims to be based in universal moral principles that apply to any situation, even if individual members *will* fall short. The very factors that would seem to make it rigid instead allow members to selectively emphasize, modify, and reinterpret aspects to fit with new circumstances and apply to new issues.

This analysis leaves a question. As noted above, members involved in discipleship get the ability to direct their studies. If there is a topic a member is interested in that Cru does not cover, their discipler may help them to learn more about it and determine what it should say. This could mean that much of the frame extension that members engage in is not broadcast for curious readers to investigate. However, Ken (one of the GCF bible study leaders) and I have talked about writing fiction, as we both have long projects that we are working on, and have occasionally discussed the moral and ethical issues within our work, and involved in writing things to spread to others. Any guidance I got from him would be less as a mentor and more as a colleague and friend. We met through GCF and had our interest in religious topics stoked and guided by it, but our discussions were as individuals. Do the explorations and conclusions of members within an SMO's umbrella "count" as parts of the organization's frame?

Reversing the Flow

Frame alignment analysis that employs the core framing tasks nearly always follows the order set out by Benford and Snow (1986), starting with the diagnosis, then moving on to prognosis, and finally motivation (Cress & Snow 2000, Karagiannis 2009, Sciubba 2014). The order is intuitive; why should a social movement try to come up with a motivation to solve a

problem that you have not even identified? The campus ministries, too, started from a clear diagnosis (the spiritual needs of college students being unmet in InterVarsity's case, the same with the addition of increasing fragmentation of faith communities and the specter of the end of civilization in the case of Cru), and they crafted a new prognostic frame that included within it that of the broader evangelical movement, but also addressed the unique circumstances of college students through both messaging and delivery.

However, once they had established themselves, the world kept changing, and their framing had to grow and adapt in response. Their prognostic frame could change in details and execution, but the basic solution it offers could not. The ministries had to develop ways to apply their pre-existing prognosis – devotion to Jesus and a selection of slowly morphing moral values derived from the Bible – to entirely new circumstances, from the advent of computers (McCall 2015), to the end of the Cold War (Turner 2008), to the US's second war in Iraq (Long 2018), to the far-right protest in Charleston (Fuller & Lundgren 2015). They face an endless parade of circumstances that they never could have predicted, and their options for adapting are constrained by their appeal to universal, eternal truth. (I am not classing these processes as frame transformation because major events to respond to seem more like the creation of new territory for established SMOs to expand into.)

It is not unheard of for social movement organizations to apply their same basic prognostic frames to new diagnoses when the same basic, as when the March of Dimes took part in the eradication of Polio and then pivoted to birth defects, premature birth and infant mortality. When you have built up the infrastructure, network, and resources to combat one problem, it is a waste to let it all dissolve instead of using it to help with another problem (Christiansen 2013). The difference in the case of the campus ministries is that they have not won. In fact, almost by design,

they cannot. In their view, the brokenness of the world is beyond humans' ability to fix. Even if everyone on the campus became an evangelical, they would still need to be guided and ministered to, and they would still find our way to different faith communities that serve different needs and preferences. When ministries apply their prognostic frame to new problems, something different is happening.

The prognosis that evangelical Christianity offers is a solution to what they view as the central problem of human existence, and the purpose of our time here on Earth. In their framing, Jesus is the way, truth, and life for *everybody*, and can guide anyone to their most fulfilled life if they just let Him. Such a life may not always be comfortable, safe, or happy, but evangelical Christianity argues that chasing comfort, safety, and happiness for our own sake is an ultimately meaningless pursuit that may not even get us any. And any worldly comforts we amass can be destroyed or taken from us, while what Jesus offers will never fade.

Now that the ministries have formed in response to the initial prognosis, they are using their prognostic frame to inform new diagnoses as issues come up, subverting the implied order of the core framing tasks. Their prognostic frame has become a highly versatile lens that they can employ as they consider new issues, or reconsider old ones. This does not mean that they have been given a simple, rote answer to every problem; as the reams of articles, hours in Bible study, and constant instruction attest, the question of how to apply this lens to one's everyday life or the greater issues of the day involves a great deal of thought and work. Applying an SMO's prognosis to the diagnosis does not answer the question of what to do ("What should I do if the tariffs on steel make me lose my job?" "Jesus."); instead, it supplies questions and ways of thinking that, according to their framing, will ideally lead adherents to answers that are consistent with the rest of their framing. ("Jesus, if I lose my job thanks to these tariffs, please help me to deal with the

challenge in a way that lives up to the principles we learned from You and continues to enact Your plan for my life. What should I do?")

For an example of the way that their expansions are not dictated by their shared prognostic frame, only informed, InterVarsity and (then) Campus Crusade for Christ had opposed responses to the war in Vietnam. InterVarsity questioned whether it met with the standards of a just war and held that we could not witness with bullets and bombs (Swartz 2012), while Campus Crusade was embroiled in "a battle for the soul of the orient," and organized against anti-war activists. (Turner 2008) Both ministries' responses to America's modern wars seems to be less focused on whether the war is correct, and more on what Christians can do to help in the environment created by it, such as by giving aid to servicemembers suffering from PTSD, and overcoming the divisions within the nation. (IVCF A 2003, Vergo 2018) A wide range of responses were open to them, but unlike SMOs with narrow foci, *not* responding was not an option. Chapter 5 will cover the process of deriving concrete plans from the ministry's framing in more detail.

Does this reversal ultimately matter? If a researcher is content with describing an SMO's frame as it presently exists, it may not. But if the goal is to understand the form that an organization's framing takes over time, and how it became what it is today, ignoring the ways that the SMO's preferred methods and solutions can influence their conception of the problem will likely leave holes in their understanding. This consciousness can also help if a researcher wants to understand or predict an SMO's response to new developments in its issue, or have a discussion with adherents about current events.

Conclusion

Benford and Snow approach frame alignment as a constant, negotiated, and conflicted process of "framing," rather than the production of finished "frames" (Benford and Snow 2000). Paying attention to the ways that social movement organizations continue to carry out the core framing tasks after their foundation, and different aspects of their framing can affect one another in unexpected ways, is just one more way to be conscious of that dynamism. Even if the basic problem an SMO is tackling does not change much in an objective stance, the way the organization sees and describes it certainly can, as with InterVarsity's relatively recent reluctance to openly state their stance on LGBT rights, and there is little reason to assume that the relationship between their diagnosis of the problem and their solution for it should remain one-way. Looking forward, chapter 6 will explore some possibilities for future sites to investigate prognostic framing having an effect on diagnostic framing; it is not solely limited to social movements with such a totalizing frame.

This chapter has provided a brief introduction to the current state of the framing of Cru and InterVarsity, but the ministries were not always the same as they are today. As society changes, ministries' tactics evolve, new questions arise that need spiritual answers, and sometimes, though they are not always happy to admit it, their stances on important issues change. The next chapter will explore how they manage such evolution while keeping a hold on their broader narrative.

Chapter 5 – Tacking on Eternal Currents: Introducing Frame Smoothing

My very last interviewee was the first to ask probing questions about my own experiences and beliefs, at least in the interview. Alex, the local director of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, wanted to know about my own faith journey, so I detailed a traumatic youthful collision with fire-and-brimstone Baptism, and how I reconciled it by approaching Christianity not as a set of truth propositions about the cosmos, but instead as a philosophical framework for making moral choices. (I left out drifting away, but that part was pretty clear to him.) "You have an admirably post-modern view," he told me as we stood to depart and shook hands, "But remember: the best reason to believe in this is because it's *true*."

I would dispute his characterization of my views, but he still pointed to an important aspect of the ministries' framing that they were obscuring. While this may vary by the member, both Cru and IVCF hold that the metaphysical aspects of their faith are just as true as the moral precepts. In fact, one of the pillars of their frame is that they are tapped into a central truth of the universe: the supremacy of God, and the form that His interest in humanity takes. The eternal, unchanging sovereign of all of time and space is reaching out to us, and the ministries hope to show us how to reach back.

However, adaptability is necessary for any social movement, and evangelicalism is no exception. Christianity could not have survived 2,000 years without changing, evangelicalism of the 1700s was wildly different than that of the modern day, and Cru today is not the same organization as the Campus Crusade for Christ founded in 1951. This presents a challenge to members of evangelical organizations, such as our campus ministries: they must adapt to a changing world without losing (or appearing to lose) their connection with the eternal truth they draw upon. In this chapter, I am introducing a tool that social movement organizations can use to overcoming this challenge: *frame smoothing tactics*, discursive practices that members of social

movement organizations undergoing changes in their framing engage in to explain the new frame and convince other members accept and incorporate it into their own personal understanding. Smoothing tactics will not always ensure a strife-free transition, they can still help members to stay invested.

As these tactics require the social movement organization to have undergone a change in its framing, this chapter will start with a brief discussion of frame transformation to lay out the six changes in the ministry's framing that will be used to illustrate them. Next, it will turn to a more detailed discussion of frame smoothing tactics, what types there are, and how they are deployed, and then present empirical examples for each. The last section will cover a similar practice called frame bridging, and explain some of the similarities and differences between the two. Overall, the aim of this chapter is to present frame smoothing tactics as a distinct contribution to frame alignment theory.

Changing Course – Frame Transformation

In frame alignment literature, "frame transformation" is used to refer to two different but closely related processes. The first, laid out by Benford and Snow in their introduction of frame alignment (1986), is the micro-mobilizational transformation of adherents' frames in response to the movement's framing; for example, Cru's articles work to convince potential members that declining spirituality and ongoing injustice in the US are solvable problems, rather than unfortunate facts of life, and this shift in perspective is the frame transformation that they hope to bring about. The second meaning, which has been deployed in more recent research (Vijay & Kulkarni 2012, Trumpy 2014), refers to actors within a movement contesting its framing and trying to change it. This could refer to either the movement's leadership attempting a course correction,

or a contingent of members who see the need for change and are willing to push for it. The latter definition is the interpretation that this chapter is working with, though the concept of smoothing connects them by describing the way that leaders try to enable members to transform their frames to match the new frames of the organization. This section will introduce six transformations in the framing of Cru and/or InterVarsity that have either undergone or are being called to, while the next section will introduce four different frame smoothing tactics and explain how they were used in the case of each transformation to convince members to accede to them.

Introducing the Examples

The six transformations can be divided into three rough groups. Two were large-scale shifts in the ministries' master frames as they related to other social movements and organizations, two were small-scale changes concerned with how meetings are carried out, and two were challenges to members in how they approached particular marginalized groups.

The two large-scale shifts were undertaken long before fieldwork, and many of my interviewees did not even know that they had occurred. The first is Cru's change in position on the Civil Rights Movement, particularly the work of Martin Luther King Jr. As noted in chapter 2, while Bill Bright had attempted to keep his ministry and political activities separate, they could not help but affect one another, particularly as Cru jockeyed with left wing movements for the attention of college students in the counter-culture era. The fact that MLK Jr. was critical of capitalism and American imperialism was one reason that, when it was active, members of Campus Crusade were forbidden from taking part in the Civil Rights Movement. But now, fifty years later, Cru supports MLK Jr, posting articles commemorating his life and describing the challenges that his work poses to Christians even today. (Berry 2008)

The second transformation, also noted in chapter 2, is both ministries' shift towards being friends and allies after decades of bitter rivalry. Cru (then Campus Crusade) once viewed InterVarsity as stodgy, stifling, and spiritually dead, while InterVarsity accused Campus Crusade of being a band of sly hucksters, inflating their conversion numbers with rededications and doing little to spread the word of God. They were not only in competition for donors, members, and souls, but believed that the other was actively harming the mission. Now, as noted above, they actively work together and will even recommend one another (along with a slate of other ministries) to UIUC students who find their needs unmet for one reason or another. (Cru Parents FAQ 2018)

The two procedural changes were undertaken during my fieldwork, and are ongoing at the time of writing. Transformation number three is a change in the presentation of the large group meetings, which are designed to be enjoyable to attend, with music, games, time to socialize, and sometimes even snacks. When I started attending in the fall of 2016, nearly every week would feature a short, goofy video or trivia game, but according to Shae, one of the MCs, they have been asked to restrain that aspect of meetings more recently – this helps to moderate the tone of meetings, gives more time to the speakers during the meeting, and demands less time of the MCs to prepare. This resembles one of the classic frame alignment examples, attracting potential adherents to organization events with live music and fun activities, but Dale, the local director of Cru, revealed a more sophisticated use for the MCs antics by pointing out that varying the tone and format of presentations over the course of the roughly hour-long meetings helps to keep students' focus after a long day of school. This was not a change in Cru's presentation that was announced, grappled with, or explained, at least to the rank-and-file membership – it just

happened, and we were left to adapt. Shae told me that a few members came to her saying that they missed the games, but that nobody was outraged.

The fourth transformation involves the attempts of both ministries to create and refine groups aimed at graduate-level students. During my tenure, Cru set out to start a graduate bible study group, recognizing that we were scattered throughout the residential groups and might have different needs and interests than the younger members, and members of InterVarsity's existing graduate ministry, GCF, laid plans to improve it. This is less obviously a change in framing, but the bible study groups are where much of the work of negotiating, grappling with, and learning the fine details of the ministry's frame happens. Given that a central pillar of the frames of both ministries is the need to effectively reach out to the student body, a change in the presentation and membership of these groups is also a change in content.

Finally, the last two examples are immediate and major, and bear on matters of oppression. The fifth transformation started in 2016, but reached the local chapter of InterVarsity as distant echo during my fieldwork in 2017. After years of research and consultation, IVCF came out with a position paper called "A Theological Summary of Human Sexuality," outlining their stances on sexuality, marriage, love, incest, and assault. This led to a policy whereby IVCF asked members who disagreed with their negative stance on same-sex relationships, premarital sex, and masturbation to resign rather than continue to work with an organization they disagree with. The "echo" that I encountered was an explanation of this policy, an acknowledgement that members may feel hurt or betrayed by it (and that these feelings are valid), and a call for understanding. I did not witness any strife or backlash in the time I attended, though my interviewees associated with InterVarsity had more variation in their stances on the morality of being LGBT. Locally, the announcement of the transformation consisted of a description of the policy, an acknowledgement

that members may feel hurt and betrayed by it, and a call for understanding. This may be less a transformation than a clarification, but I am including it because it came as a surprise to many members across the nation – they experienced it as a transformation, and their own conceptions of the ministry have transformed in turn.

The last example is a call for transformation within InterVarsity, rather than one that it has already undergone. One of the speakers who came to InterVarsity in the fall of 2017 was a preacher named Michelle Hayden, who gave a sermon entitled "What Does the Bible Say About… Multiethnicity and Justice?" One of the main thrusts of this sermon was a call for a truly multiethnic church movement, as the gospel has to be for everyone if it's for anyone, and a warning about how uncomfortable and difficult forging towards such a movement could turn out to be. At UIUC, InterVarsity is more diverse than Cru, but Hayden holds that being a true multiethnic movement entailed more than the mere presence of different ethnicities, as it must also acknowledge their various needs and perspectives. This call had the potential to be unsettling to members for a variety of reasons, not the least of which, according to her, is that many of the white congregants were in the position of thinking that the change she called for had already been made, when it had not been.

In all six cases, the leadership of the campus ministries decided that some change to their goals, operations, or rhetoric was needed, but this change did not instantly radiate out to the thousands of members across the nation (or even, in the case of smaller scale changes, to the dozens who attend at UIUC.) Directly or indirectly, members would need to be convinced to accept the new framing, and that's where frame smoothing tactics come in.

Frame Smoothing Tactics

When a social movement organization is undergoing a transformation in its framing, smoothing tactics situate the new framing in relation to the old, either showing the new faming to be more effective for dealing with the issues that the movement is tackling, more relevant to members' present-day circumstances, or more consistent with the values that members hold. While the change in framing may not be "easy" or without friction, the goal of these tactics is to get as many members as possible to accept the new framing, and, sometimes, to warn away those members who cannot, which can make the transition for those who remain easier to negotiate. As the examples of transformation above are focused on top-down decisions within the ministries[6], this chapter will focus on smoothing tactics undertaken by leaders to convince the membership. In SMOs with more horizontal organization, it's possible that smoothing tactics could be undertaken by more different kinds of members, but this was the form most readily observed in campus ministries.

In the current study, I observed four main types of frame smoothing tactics: *emphasizing growth*, *emphasizing continuity*, *eliding change*, and *inviting participation*. Each draws a different relationship between the new and the old framing, seeks to convince members in a different way, and can be deployed in different combinations or sequences. They can also be applied to changes in any of the core framing tasks – prognostic, diagnostic, or motivational (Benford and Snow 2000) – as members are able to notice and respond to changes in the organization's goals, methods, and reasoning. The versatility of the concept presents the risk of applying the concept of framing too broadly (Oliver and Johnston 2000), but frame smoothing is ultimately concerned with the

[6] Hayden's call for racial justice is a potential exception, but she was still speaking to us from a position of authority, and surrounded by staffers wearing *Black Lives Matter* T-shirts, so her words had the firm endorsement of the local chapter, at least.

presentation of these changes to members, and the interpretations of these changes that they are encouraged to take, so it falls within the purview of frame alignment theory. After introducing each of the four types, this section will use the examples of frame transformation listed in the previous section illustrate examples of each, and some of the ways that they can interact with one another.

Emphasizing growth is the most straightforward tactic, but the rhetorical and emotional tone it can take varies widely. When a speaker, writer, or leader uses it, they are criticizing the previous framing in favor of the new one, and trying to make a case that the new framing is more consistent with the values that drew members to join or effective in meeting its goals. This can require admitting that the SMO was morally or tactically in the wrong before, or at least that some of its members were misguided. There are a wide range of reasons for the past framing to be wrong, from malice to incompetence to ignorance, which means that the explanation for the change can include instruction, encouragement, justification, or even rebuke. The examples below will demonstrate that confronting members with flaws in the SMO can risk their investment in the organization or make them feel personally attacked, but, conversely, some issues are difficult or impossible to convincing address without admitting fault in the past approach one's organization has taken. The most important marker of emphasizing growth is the acknowledgement of a past framing that was insufficient, and an argument that the new one is better.

Emphasizing continuity entails describing the new frame in terms that align it with values that have remained consistent through the transformation, assuring members that they haven't lost their reason for joining. This tactic is more likely to take a conciliatory or reassuring tone, as it focuses on things that members will not need to adjust to. While it can be used in situations where the SMO has been made to change its framing by outside forces and does not consider the previous

framing to be a problem, it is not mutually exclusive with emphasizing growth; they can be used together, with the elements that remain constant serving to reassure or encourage members who are considering the changes being asked of them. Overall, emphasizing continuity is marked by discussion of aspects of the SMO's values, goals, methods, or focus that remain constant through the change.

Eliding change is a substantially different approach from either of the previous tactics. Instead of acknowledging the change in framing at all, the changed is smoothed by avoiding talking about the change, and treat the new frame as though it were always in place. This could be done deceptively, in an effort to pretend the old frame was always in place, but there are also examples of elision working to smooth small changes so that members don't even think to object, or changes that were made in the past and considered a settled matter that shouldn't trouble current members. Eliding change can be difficult to identify, as it hinges on things that are not said, rather than concrete statements, but it can be identified by finding points in the SMO's history where it has employed very different framing and investigating whether the change over time is discussed in its literature or known to members.

Inviting participation as a tactic involves turning the question of what the new framing should look like to the members themselves. If leaders can afford some flexibility in their approach, they can let the members tell them what will resonate. As a frame smoothing tactic, inviting participation gives members a voice in the formation of the new frame, or at least a forum for responding to it. In either case, leaders are counting on the members to do some of the work of smoothing for them.

None of these tactics are always successful, though a failure to smooth can have very different consequences depending on the magnitude of the transformation and the degree of

investment that members had in the old framing (or their disdain for the new.) The failures below include cases where a few members felt the loss of the old way and idly complained (elision applied to dropping the games before Cru meetings), and members being driven not just from the ministry, but possibly the evangelical movement altogether (emphasizing continuity applied to InterVarsity's purge.) All frame smoothing tactics can be resisted, or fall short, but they have the goal of bringing as much of the SMO's membership along with the transformation as possible.

Table 1 – Frame Smoothing Tactics Summarized

Tactic	Tone	Argument
Emphasizing Growth	Varied	New framing corrects problems with the old.
Emphasizing Continuity	Reassuring	New framing retains what drew members to the old.
Eliding Change	Silent	Old framing is ignored.
Inviting Participation	Questioning	New framing is built by members or open to comment.

The following subsections will demonstrate that members are likely to use all four tactics at different points in a single transformation, or for different aspects simultaneously. The campus ministries employed multiple tactics for all six of these transformations, demonstrating that the same tactics can serve different purposes depending on what combinations they are used in. This section will close with some questions that this initial exploration leaves for future research.

Emphasizing Growth

Emphasizing growth can be a risky tactic, as it involves directly and openly acknowledging the change in the SMO's frame, and explaining why the transformation is/was necessary. As noted in chapter 4, speakers at campus ministry meetings save their harshest words for themselves and their organizations, and times of transformation can give them an opportunity to cut loose and underline the need for change.

InterVarsity engaged with this tactic in the most direct way, most clearly in Hayden's call for a true multiethnic ministry. Her sermon reckons with the divide between Black and white evangelicalism, and the history that has led Christians to be complicit in oppression not only on race lines, but also over gender, mental health, and sexual orientation. Her formula for transforming the ministry started with a prayer for God to help us cast aside foolishness, so that individuals within the ministry can become more willing to overcome their own prejudices, their fear and discomfort towards change, and their comfort with the status quo, without becoming "crusaders." (Her example to avoid was telling grandma she's an awful racist on her deathbed. "Sometimes you have to give up no matter how right you are. Or how *white* you are.") The sermon was more of a call to action than a detailed plan, emphasizing that InterVarsity had a long way to go, and that the members were responsible for helping it get there.

As we saw in chapter 3, racial justice has been a defining issue in IVCF throughout its existence, most especially since the era of the Civil Rights Movement in the US. In 1971, pastor Tom Skinner stood in the stadium in Urbana and preached to InterVarsity members from around the nation about the church's complicity in upholding white supremacy and discrimination faced by Black Americans within and beyond the church, and advocating for a shift towards a social gospel that would actually help and serve them as well as white Christians who wanted to live in a just society. (Skinner 1971) Now, nearly 50 years later, Hayden came to UIUC to tell us how the church was still failing, and what we would need to do to fix it. The long-term nature of this project shows that, just like transformation, smoothing is not an instant operation. IVCF will continue struggling, shifting, and rearranging in attempts to bring about greater racial justice within its ranks and in the world beyond, and members will need to be kept up-to-date on the changes, reassured of their course, and directed if they are going to take part.

Similarly, in their clarification on their stance on LGBT issues, the speaker for InterVarsity acknowledged that "the church" (presumably including InterVarsity) had a long history of mistreating LGBT people. This marks one way that they intend for their approach to change moving forward, shifting towards compassion and understanding LGBT people, whose "sinful" desires are merely a reflection of the world, and do not make them worse than anyone else. However, this stance was little comfort to members who now found themselves on the outside, and difficult to square with the decision that everyone who disagreed with the organization on this one issue should resign. And indeed, as a result of this change, IVCF faced widespread outcry and resignations by faithful members who felt bewildered, betrayed, and outraged (Pritchett 2016, Lin 2016.) This is the clearest example of the six transformations of a course of frame smoothing that was not successful for every member. I did not encounter any members who spoke of being directly affected in my fieldwork, and, given that they were threatened with expulsion, it did not seem wise to try and seek them out.

On a much smaller scale, in the planning meetings for GCF's approach to ministry in the coming year, the local director led us through a frank discussion of some of the shortcomings that the ministry was showing, most notably a lack of community and a feeling of mission, reducing GCF to "a youth group for grad students." As Graham, a first-year member, put it, "The core people have an idea of what they want GCF to be. I wouldn't say that GCF as a whole does." But then, weeks later, we and members from the various other GCF bible study groups had come together to reckon with these shortcomings and make something better.

As noted, attacking the organization's own previous frame risks undercutting their support with the people who came for it. Hayden warned that many listeners might find her message uncomfortable, and the speaker who announced InterVarsity's stance on LGBT issues admitted

that many of those listening might feel hurt, and had a right to be. The criticism of the old way can absolutely be a blow against members, and some may not stay for it; imagine being a faithful member of InterVarsity for years, and a supporter of LGBT rights, and being informed that not only should you resign, but you probably should not have been a member in the first place. For many members, this was devastating. (Ford and Jenkins 2016)

In formal and informal interviews, I did not encounter anyone who objected to either of these transformations (and the change in GCF seemed to be something that everyone was looking forward to), but I did talk to members of both ministries who expressed uncertainty or discomfort over the issues that they touched on. For instance, Amanda (GCF) was unsure if racial reconciliation should be foundational to a ministry, and Ray (Cru) mentioned the Black Lives Matter connection in IVCF to me, as an example of their different focus. For all Hayden knew, the congregation could have been full of members who felt this way, but if she (and the local leaders who invited her to come) found the change to be important enough, there may have been no way out but through. She did, however, cut her criticism with the next tactic.

Emphasizing Continuity

When Hayden laid out her program of racial reconciliation, she emphasized that these priorities reflected a continuation of Jesus's mission on Earth. After all, Jesus spent his time with tax collectors, sex workers, widows, lepers, and other outcasts, welcoming them into the fold, and in the early days when the church was not the power of the land, they were much better at reaching out to the powerless and offering them aid and love. Christianity used to be a movement made of outsiders, and her call reached back to that essence.[7] Combined with emphasizing growth, this

[7] In a GCF meeting, I remarked that Emperor Constantine deciding that he wanted to be a Christian could be one of the worst things to happen to Christianity, and was flabbergasted at how well-received it was. The ministries' shying

tactic creates a narrative of the organization, or the movement as a whole, losing its way and then getting back on track.

Also concerned with racism, Cru's recent writings on Martin Luther King Jr. also emphasize how consistent his convictions and activities are with the outlook that they want to encourage. "How MLK Challenges Us All," for instance, recounts the author's encounter with the *Letter From a Birmingham Jail*. It points out that MLK thought the church was essential, briefly lays out a biblical basis for activism, and echoes his call for the church to rediscover the sacrificial spirit that allows it to stand up for the powerless. These are presented as surprising in the sense that the reader may not have connected social activism to their faith, but Berry makes the case that they fit together, and always have. (Berry 2008)

InterVarsity's call for LGBT members and supporters to reconsider the ministry's doctrine on sexuality and whether they want to stay also had an emphasis on continuity as its basis, to the point that it was characterized as a clarification of stances that they already held, rather than a change. Their entire defense for this call was rooted in an appeal to unchanging scripture. The transformation in this case was prognostic rather than diagnostic in nature, setting out to make their membership take a greater stake in living out their values, or leave. (Shellnutt 2016, IVCF Press Room 2016)

The GCF planning meetings started with a thorough briefing on the framing of the ministry. This way, we would be guided in our thoughts and recommendations towards the principles and goals of the ministry. The transformation that Director Cecil was guiding us towards was a matter of method; how can we better achieve what we have been trying to do all this time? The continuity of goals was important. Between these, we can see that emphasizing continuity can be used for

from politics seems to come not only from a desire not to drive students of this or that party away, but also from a suspicion of the corrupting aspects of temporal power.

big changes, in order to make them more acceptable, or for more subtle changes, as a means of keeping them from getting out of hand.

One of my interview questions was whether the interviewees could see themselves leaving the ministry over disagreements they have with other members, and the answers were remarkably consistent across ministries, levels of engagement, and ages. Members would lay out a few foundational aspects of the Christian faith, including Jesus as the Son of God and the necessity of accepting him into your life and follow his teachings, and then say that breaking with those principles is the one reason they would leave on ideological grounds. As long as the ministries hold true to these central points, they do not need to worry about losing adherents to details. In a sense, this strategy echoes framing strategies that seek to build resonance with the broader culture. However, in this case, architects of the new frame are trying to maintain resonance with the values, principles, and rules that members of the SMO hold internally.

Eliding Change

The clearest case of eliding change among my examples is Cru's current treatment of Martin Luther King Jr Day – the current articles simply do not bring up Cru's old stance in relation to the Civil Rights Movement, nor what Bright of the 1960s would think of a "biblical basis for activism." Instead, King is offered as an inspiration, model, and challenge for members today. This way, Cru's shift towards lauding and accepting MLK is smoothed by leaving it alone and treating the new frame as the default. For another example, neither campus ministry is in the habit of bringing up their former rivalry, and some of the members I asked about their attitudes were surprised to learn that they had ever had a negative relationship.

In comparison, removing the games as a feature of Cru's large group meetings is a comically minor change, but it had an effect on the way that members experienced their message, so it was significant. The elision here was not a change lost to history or a delicate topic to step carefully around, but rather something that the leadership did not think was worth bringing up. Instead of doing or saying anything to acknowledge the change in policy in front of the membership, they just did it.

Elision may sound Orwellian, but from my observations, there are at least four reasons that an organization might choose to elide past changes to their framing, apart from deception. The first is particular to the circumstances of campus ministries: a common theme in my interviews with both Alex and Dale was the lack of institutional memory that comes with a constant churn of membership, with students moving through their college years and staffers completing their 1-to-3-year terms. This means that speakers and writers simply may not know about this history, as with the interviewees who were surprised to learn about their ministry's past relationship with the other. However, the revelation did not concern any of them; they remained concerned with what their ministry is and can be *now*.

The second reason is that, when a new frame becomes a settled question, adherents may no longer feel the need to dig up the old one to relitigate it. When politicians on both sides of the aisle try to claim Martin Luther King Jr, and racial inequality in the US is still so apparent, it may make sense for Cru to agree that he was in the right, as well. After all, this dissertation did not start with an argument against Durkheim's *Elemental Forms of Religious Thought*, not because that is an understanding of religion that it is aligned with, but because the field has left it behind long ago.

The third reason is that speakers and writers for the ministry might shy from even bringing up old stances because they think that even bringing them up will be hurtful or counterproductive. Even in her apologetic address, the speaker for InterVarsity declined to actually state what they believed the Biblically mandated stance on LGBT issues to be. This was a common habit among members of both ministries, including most of my interviewees, and even the outside speaker who came in for the All Campus Worship (outlined below.) Only once, in a Cru sermon, was it directly stated in a meeting that they viewed same-sex attraction as sinful, and apart from InterVarsity's formal announcement and Hayden's acknowledgement of sexual orientation as an axis of oppression, was the only time LGBT issues came up in any large group meetings I attended. As the thing left unstated is assumed to be clear to everyone present, it seems that deception is not the objective – though the effort to avoid stating the stance that everyone in the conversation could still be read as disingenuous. Hearing a statement that amounts to "the way you in particular experience the world is sinful" can still be a punch in the gut, and campus ministry members do not seem eager to throw that punch.

Finally, in the case of minor changes like Cru having games in their large group meetings less often, pointing out the change might cause more outcry than just carrying it out, and letting members notice. According to a long-time MC named Shae, a few members did come to her expressing disappointment with the change, but there was no uproar. While the change did significantly affect the way that members experienced meetings, announcing it formally may have acted to attach more significance to the change than it warranted, at least in Director Dale's estimation. (Shae was grateful for the lessened demand on her time, as well.)

Because the aim is not always deception, elision is not always complete. For instance, a curious InterVarsity member could go to their website and read an article about the Chicago

agreement, signed in 2010 to reaffirm the ministries' partnership as "spirits of competition" were rearing their heads (Lundgren 2014). The Trail West agreement is not secret – its principles are just so widely accepted among ministry members that it does not come up in conversation or sermons very often. The information is there to find, even if it is not volunteered.

Two of the three of the examples of elision I could find in this case were older – shifts that had happened in the 70s at the earliest. It could be that eliding change is at the end of a frame transformation sequence, and that whenever a frame changes, it will eventually reach the point that the old one no longer has enough sway to worry about. I would hesitate to put this forward as a universal sequence, however, and will propose some ways to explore the question in the conclusion.

Inviting Participation

Cru's and InterVarsity's graduate ministries both employed this tactic extensively, at different times. It was routine in GCF, at least in Mae and Ken's bible study group, to have a say in what the future curriculum will be, and what pace we will move at, particularly after the planning meetings detailed below. In both graduate groups, moment to moment participation was also more level than in the undergraduate bible studies that I attended. The difference was similar to an undergraduate discussion section as opposed to a graduate seminar; the undergrad study was not completely directed, but the leader bore more responsibility for the momentum and content of the discussion.

When I arrived in 2017, Cru lacked a grad bible study group, but I was put in contact with a staffer who wanted to form one, and a group of us met at odd times and places three times over the course of as many weeks, before we all filtered away without deciding much. We were also

offered copies of the materials that bible study leaders were using in each of the residential groups, to use as we would in shaping the new curriculum (I requested a copy, but the meeting where I would have received it never happened.) After that, it was a complete surprise to me when I returned the following year and found a fully formed (though small) graduate bible study group attached to the Presby Hall group I had been attending. The tone of those meetings was very similar to the GCF studies, right down to the immortal question, "What's at stake in this passage?", though this could be because many of the members of this group had left GCF in search of a greater sense of connection to the ministry's broader community.

Meanwhile, the broader membership of GCF met a few times over the summer between years to strategize about the coming year. Adjusting the course of a mature, pre-existing ministry, we were treated to extensive explanations of the ministry's mission and what we were hoping to accomplish. (I will expand on this in the next section, on frame bridging.) The questions posed to us, and the forum that we were given for offering suggestions, were embedded in a program of emphasizing growth. The close guidance we received demonstrates that inviting participation is not a total release of control, and suggestions that were too far beyond the pale could be quickly addressed and negotiated. (That said, while there were many suggestions that we did not end up using, none were called out as unusable in either of the planning meetings I attended.) These meetings each had around twenty participants, all of whom were welcome to share ideas and commentary as the discussion roved over the various aspects of GCF's operation, including inviting speakers for dinner meetings, the format of bible studies, and our relationship to both InterVarsity and the university. We discussed the idea of dividing study groups differently, possibly by gender, but Kay – who had mentioned in an interview that she couldn't always let her guard down in our bible study group because there were so many guys – swiftly shot the idea

down. Study group meetings in the following year revealed that while the director was still not exercising strict control over bible studies, he was offering more materials and guidance that leaders could avail themselves of, and listening to what the leaders were up to in their groups.

InterVarsity called for another form of participation in the wake of their clarification of their stance on LGBT issues. In this case, the collaborative participation was long past – the speaker emphasized that InterVarsity's study had been carried out with the participation of theologians, LGBT Christians, and InterVarsity staff from all over – but they could still offer members a chance to have their concerns heard, their doubts addressed, and their questions answered in private. The transformation was smoothed not in having a say about how it happened, but in having their say after. Additionally, we could read their call for resignation as a form of inviting participation – a practice that would smooth the change (or clarification, in this case) for those who remain.

In all three cases, members were encouraged to act in response to the proposed changes to the ministries' frames. Avoiding the perception that members are passive consumers of a prepackaged frame is not only good practice from the perspective of acknowledging the agency and intelligence of SMO members, but also allows us to see when leaders are counting on their active participation in shaping the frame moving forward. Even when members do not have the ability to change what the frame will, as with the IVCF case here, they can still work to make sense of it and decide what they will do in response.

Patterns

Table 2 – Transformations and Tactics Summarized

Transformation	SMO	Timeframe	Smoothing Tactics
Civil Rights Movement	Cru	Long Past	Continuity, Elision
Rivalry Ended	Both	Long Past	Continuity, Elision
Fewer Games in Meetings	Cru	Recent	Elision
Graduate Meetings	Both	Ongoing	Growth, Continuity, Participation
LGBT Purge	IVCF	Recent	Continuity, Participation
Multiethnic Ministry	IVCF	Ongoing	Growth, Continuity, Participation

A number of patterns stand out in this analysis, mainly in the types of situations that the different frame smoothing tactics are used for. First, emphasizing continuity is an important component of frame smoothing, and seems to appear in every case except for the one that was so minor that the ministry leadership seemed to want to slip it by without notice. If a transformation in any aspect of an SMO's framing is being discussed, explaining how the change can be reconciled with the values, goals, and understanding of the current membership seems to be essential. However, the degree of emphasis can change between cases, with InterVarsity taking its stand on matters of sexuality being the strongest, while the call for multiethnic ministry more strongly emphasized a break with the past.

Second, at least in these six examples, elision is reserved for either tiny changes or transformations that took place in the "distant" past. (One could argue that 50 years is not so long ago, but in the reckoning of a ministry that has such rapid turnover of membership, it is many "generations" of members ago.) It may be different for other types of SMOs, but campus ministries seem disinclined to dig up old controversies and dissect them.

Third, emphasizing growth comes up most often in transformations that are being called for or coordinated, rather than those that have already taken place. In most cases, there is less need

to directly champion the new framing once it is in place and does not have to defeat an entrenched framing.

Taken together, these observations seem to suggest a timeline of frame smoothing, where a transformation of an SMO's frame is accompanied by arguments that emphasize what an improvement over the old framing it is (Growth), as well as vetting the new framing against the values and goals that the SMO holds as important (Continuity), and, if it is accepted, eventually reaching a state where it no longer has to defend itself and the old framing is just a historical curiosity (Elision.) Future work in other kinds of movements will be able to determine if this is a more general pattern in frame smoothing tactics, or just the way the examples in this study played out.

The next section covers a long-established frame alignment process that has some thematic similarities to smoothing: frame bridging. After an exploration of some of the other groups that the campus ministries want to connect to, it will explain the similarities and differences between frame bridging and smoothing.

Ministries Reach Out – Frame Bridging

According to Benford and Snow (2000), "Frame bridging refers to the linking of two or more ideologically congruent but structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem. Bridging can occur between a movement and individuals, through the linkage of a movement organization with an unmobilized sentiment pool or public opinion cluster, or across social movements." It is a process of gathering new adherents from potentially interested groups, or at least making allies of them. This has led Doug McAdam to assert that bridging and extension are essentially the same process, as extension simply means that you are building a bridge from

your social movement's framing to link it to existing sentiment pools, even if they do not have a developed and clearly articulated frame already (McAdam 2012).

Without challenging McAdam's definition, this section will approach the concept of frame bridging more narrowly, and address four examples of frame bridging that are distinct from the ravenous process of frame extension outlined in chapter 3. There, I treated extension as being concerned with *issues*, rather than groups of people or organizations. Using this conception, a social movement organization could engage in frame extension *in order to* build a bridge to another organization or population cluster's framing, but that SMO could also engage in frame extension solely to increase the resonance of its framing for its already-existing members (e.g. a campus ministry putting out a simple, practical article about items that are useful to pack when you are first heading off to college. (Ackman 2016)) Bridging, on the other hand, requires that there be another group to build a bridge to. (This distinction may still be blurry, as campus ministries want to reach *every* population cluster and sentiment pool, but distinguishing from expanding into new issues and reaching out to defined groups of people can still help us to classify their activities.)

Thus, the four cases that this section will cover are situations where the ministries have identified other organizations or communities that they see as having distinct frames, and consciously work to integrate their own framing with that of the others. The first bridge is between the ministries and the university that they are embedded in, the second is between the various ministries on campus, the third is between different racial communities within their ministry (particularly Black students and others), and the fourth is between the ministry and the people who they hope to witness to on their mission trips.

Between Academia and the Church

Campus ministries have had difficulty operating on some campuses, as when InterVarsity was "derecognized" at California State University, and had to find ways to operate without formal support (IVCF Press Room 2014.) Cru, InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, and its graduate ministry, Graduate Christian Fellowship, are all registered student organizations at UIUC, and have had an easier time fitting into academic life here. Chapter 3 discussed some of their efforts to position themselves as a positive presence on campus, but they go further in building a bridge to the academic world than just not causing trouble. In many ways, members' growth within the ministries echoes the advance of their academic career.

One of the most straightforward ways that campus ministries can link to members' experience of academia is in the format of courses and in moving on to more challenging topics and explorations, mirroring the increasing responsibility and expectations that many members will be experiencing in other areas of their life. In particular, the format of the bible studies at each level (new freshmen, or longtime members, or graduate) would resemble the format of classes that students at that level would likely be taking. Cru bible study meetings were not totally didactic, and a definite shift from youthful "Sunday school," but every meeting had a curriculum – one or more lessons that Jed wanted to convey. Members were still free to raise their own thoughts and concerns, and long discussions spun out of questions raised by members. Jed projected confidence in the face of these questions, and rarely left us wondering, even if other members helped us to find our way to the conclusion. Attending these meetings, I flashed back to my own early days of undergraduate college, and the stiff, disorienting feeling of discovering that I could "talk back" and offer insights even as we marched through the 101-level syllabi.

Meanwhile, the graduate meetings in both Intervarsity's GCF ministry and Cru's brand-new graduate chapter had the feel of a graduate seminar, putting far more of the onus on members to supply content and understanding to discussions. Our "syllabus" for each GCF meeting was little more than a list of questions that Ken and Mae were interested in, rather than a set of lessons that they hoped to convey; the first question after we got done reading that week's section was always, "Does anyone have anything that stuck out to them? Anything you want to bring up?" and there always was something. In the first GCF meeting I attended, Ken explicitly invited members to argue back and "fight out" the meanings of the bible verses that we would be addressing. (That said, rather than being "fought out," disagreements were most often stated and then let be; generally, members of the bible study did not seem interested in telling one another that they were wrong about this or that.) Disagreements or concerns would not be stomped flat in the undergraduate bible studies, but I saw fewer. When GCF met in the summer and finally discussed the ministry's mission, the director was particularly overt about the ministry's goal to challenge members more than they may have been before. "This shouldn't just be a youth group for grad students," he said as we set out to plan the next semester. "That would be like an adult wearing diapers – kind of obscene!"

Similarly, both ministries go to significant lengths to allow members to take responsibility for running parts of the organization and making activities possible. Cru even has an expected progression for long-term members, having them take on mentees in discipleship, find ways to take part in running the ministry, and eventually lead or co-lead a bible study group when they're juniors or seniors. When I commented that this seemed like a fast progression, a member named Erin, a student who leads a bible study group of "returners" (generally sophomores), replied, "In some cases, it's a lot to ask of someone. But sometimes that sort of step is what they need –

someone to challenge them, and push them towards more commitment." In Cru, the practice of discipleship outlined in chapter 4 grants individual members responsibility and agency within the organization without requiring that every long-time member to have a bible study group to lead. InterVarsity also regularly asks for volunteers to aid in events, take up bible studies, and join the various teams. In both ministries, MCs and the "worship team," the band that leads everyone in songs, are always students.

GCF, on the other hand, seems to place no demands or expectations on members who aren't leading groups, but this might be the only way to keep busy graduate students who are deeply embedded in their respective departments. However, while GCF members are not called upon to man tables at bake sales or strike up random conversations on the quad, the integration of Christian faith, learning, and practice is a central part of their vision. "We are always undergoing spiritual formation," Director Cecil told us. "The question is whether it's *Christian* spiritual formation." Rather than calling upon members to take time away from their fields to do separate Christian activities (though a little time out is encouraged), GCF tells them to always remember to practice Christianity wherever they are, whatever they are doing. Their identities as Christians and as academics are to be interwoven, building their ability to approach their faith with wisdom and discernment, and to approach their fields with compassion, discipline, and integrity. As GCF member Kyle pointed out, ministry's very existence and each individual membership is a process of constant bridging between faith and field, seeking to show that there is no inherent contradiction between their religion and their profession.

Ultimately, the ministries do not present themselves as insurgents in academia, but instead see their mission as complementary to that of the school they are embedded in, offering something that mere academic knowledge does not. "[God] wants us to work hard, and do well in school,"

Prudence, a Cru member, told me. "But that's not my life goal. It's not to get a good job, or retire early." Their goal is that campus ministry members become valuable and helpful members of the campus community, and beyond. Both Cru and InterVarsity offer articles and advice for the transition from college to the life after, including getting started in a new place (Ferchak 2016), job interviews (Moore 2013), and making peace with a professional or academic life that may not look like everyone else's (Rieck 2017). Members seriously practicing their Christianity may require some friction with the broader culture, but they and their ministries benefit from a strong bridge between ministry and academy.

UIUC presents college as a time of growth, discovery, and preparing to launch out into the world as an adult; both Cru and InterVarsity tailor their approach to dovetail with this narrative, and, at least according to my formal and informal interviewees, this approach lines up well with their expectations and hopes. A major emphasis, particularly in GCF, is that growing in knowledge about the temporal world is not opposed to devotion to Jesus, regardless of your field. My interviewees included students studying agricultural sciences, physics, social work, English, and others, and none saw a conflict with the ministries' mission. The ministries' stance on LGBT issues may cause more trouble for sociologists, psychologists, and social workers than in other fields, but as GCF member Soo Min shared in the previous chapter, it is easy for believers to simply disagree and continue to attend.

To a degree, the mere existence and popularity of the various campus ministries at UIUC represent a victory on this front – 12 campus ministries as registered student organizations in good standing, collectively serving hundreds of members, is a powerful testament to the success of their framing. They cannot rest on this victory, though, and constantly work to maintain their presence

and function in campus life. And while it may seem like this profusion of ministries would be a fraught landscape for any one of them, they have strategies for managing it.

Between Ministries

The rivalry between the ministries has cooled, at least on UIUC's campus. I had expected members of each ministry to have strong opinions about the others at the beginning of fieldwork, but Erin of Cru summed up the general attitude that I encountered among members: "I'm just not in complete awareness of what their theological leanings are...I know there are other solid ministries on campus." On further reflection, she added, "We *are* all striving for the same thing." To the extent that they think about one another, their attention is mostly positive; this attitude is deliberately cultivated in recognition of the ministries' place as small parts of a much larger movement and Christian community.

In 2011, multiple ministries including InterVarsity and Cru signed the Chicago Agreement, which reaffirmed their commitment to working together and gainfully sharing campuses with one another. This agreement is boiled down to eight simple precepts, including not poaching members from one another, encouraging members to pick one primary organization, refraining from criticizing one another, and working together to solve problems humbly. (InterVarsity 2011)

At the beginning of field work, I had no idea how well ground-level members would follow these rules, but the lack of criticism, at least, held true. When I asked, most interviewees didn't have particular opinions about the other ministries, and actually asked me to tell them about the other one I was studying. Most stories of how they came to Cru or InterVarsity amounted to it being the first table they encountered on quad day, or a friend or family member bringing them in. A few, including Shae and Graham, had attended others and come to their current ministries by

discovering that it met their needs more fully, but both acknowledged the value of the ministries they'd left behind. I was frequently told that this degree of community and warm regard between ministries shouldn't be taken for granted, and that not all campuses had it.

Discussing the differences between ministries, I brought up an early sermon by Cru in which the speaker referred to Buddhist rituals as "empty religion," and two different IVCF members in separate conversations said that they thought Cru was too quick to speak dismissively of other religions. (By contrast, my first exposure to IVCF was an open mic night where one member happily told us about how her Muslim roommate saved her day and showed her God's love.) Also, when the subject of InterVarsity's greater diversity came up in my interview with Alex, and he suggested that Cru's likely response, forming a dedicated Black sub-ministry, would not serve the purpose they were hoping for.

I did not encounter any comparable criticisms of InterVarsity among Cru members, though, as noted above, I talked with a Cru staffer named Ray who suggested that InterVarsity might focus too much on "social issues" such as racism and disability rights. While it seems like IVCF has a bit more to say against Cru than the reverse, this is positively gentle compared to calling them frauds and enemies like they used to, and all of the people I heard criticisms from had to be prodded into it, to the point that I eventually stopped trying.

The most striking effort UIUC's campus ministries make at showing this greater community is the All Campus Worship (ACW.) The ACW is a yearly event held in November, filling Foellinger Auditorium with members of dozens of local ministries, not limited to the Christian registered student organizations on campus, but including charity organizations like Salt & Light, local churches, and others. One of the slides celebrating this fact featured a list of 42 organizations that could have representatives there. The event itself takes a similar, but simpler

form to the regular large group meetings: music, sermon/talk, group prayer, and then more music to see us out.

As expected, the attendance of the All Campus Worship was more diverse than any one ministry, in terms of race, age, disability status, and subset of Christianity. A few members even brought small children, which I had only seen very rarely at Cru, and never at InterVarsity. In announcements from both ministries, and from a member of the worship team in 2016, we were told that this was a small taste of what heaven would be like: all different kinds of people joined in worship.

In 2016, the speaker was the Reverend Charlie Dates of Progressive Baptist Church (PBC). He was speaking in the wake of the 2016 presidential election, and so giving a sermon about love in a nation so divided and reeling with animosity was a tall order. His was a strident sermon about our need to show love to others, especially others who don't look like us, and *especially* others in "the body of Christ" (the church.) That, by definition, we can only be Godly be showing God's love to one another. As noted in chapter 3, one of the major themes of this sermon was that true love is defined by God, and resists humans' "whimsical" and "carnal" redefinitions, a blow against modern sexual morality, including but not limited to changing attitudes towards LGBT issues.

2017's ACW had a very different tone and subject, fittingly, and brought in Nathan Montgomery, the director of Salt & Light, to talk about the recent transformations that the charity had undergone since 2014 in transitioning from simply distributing aid to offering the recipients opportunities to help in return, making them feel like they have something to offer and affording them more dignity in their relationship with the ministry. While his arguments were grounded in bible verses and a Christian concept of love, his subject was a practical, system-oriented way of helping people in the community with both physical and spiritual needs. In tone and presentation,

right down to Montgomery's sport coat and discussion of using the terms "clients" vs "participants," it had the feel of a TED Talk or business pitch. Whoever 2018's All Campus Worship invites, it is likely that their presentation will be very different from either of these talks.

On the whole, the campus ministries of UIUC are too focused on their own activities to pay one another much attention, and do not consider themselves to be in any kind of competition. To the extent that they figure into one another's framing, their differences are emphasized as positive, allowing the gospel to reach more people. Apart from occasional mild criticisms, as noted above, members are generally glad for the other ministries' presence, and the ministries all fit into a warm, if distant, community together.

The next subsection covers a point of contention that indicates deeper divisions between the two ministries, but also, perhaps, the point that Cru member Shae was making when she said, "the cool thing {about campus ministries} is that we have a variety, all working towards that mutual goal, but in different ways."

Between Cultures within the US

One of the people Liam and I talked to as we made our rounds in the *Storm the Quad* event was a young man who already had a faith community he was happy with: the international student ministry with Covenant Fellowship Church. As we moved on, Liam commented that he wasn't surprised that he had fallen in with CFC, as that church was led by a Korean family, and people are naturally attracted to others like themselves. I suggested that international students were probably happy to have ministers who understood what they were going through, and Liam agreed. He wasn't sure if the overwhelming whiteness of Cru was a problem, but he could see why the ministry wouldn't be happy with it. The literature on Korean American campus ministries bears

some of our speculations out; according to Kim (2004), second-generation Korean Americans seek out ministries with strong ethnic boundaries as a result of their marginalization in US society and their experiences of being pushed to the margins in majority-white and pan-ethnic ministries.

Director Dale of Cru has noted this, and, in our interview, mentioned Jed's outreach to Black students and expressed a desire to start an Impact Ministry here at UIUC. When I mentioned his desire to Director Alex of InterVarsity, I learned that the two ministries have different ideas about how to integrate different communities, particularly here at UIUC. Alex's view is that a much of the value of diversity came from being in close contact with different sorts of people, while a series of specialized ministries would section them off. Rather than giving different groups separate spaces, InterVarsity prefers to bring them together and face the issues that arise head-on.

However, following the death of Michael Brown and subsequent unrest in Ferguson, an InterVarsity contributor named Jazzy Johnson (2015) pointed out a concern that arises with this approach. "Let us not prioritize helping our ministries engage with justice and reconciliation over pastorally caring for our black and brown students in this time—this is also justice, this is also reconciliation. Let us not seek only the growth of our white students at the expense of our students of color, particularly our black and brown students in this time in our history." She contends that Black and brown students at predominantly white institutions are constantly navigating spaces not designed for them and fighting to prove their lives, perspectives, and values matter, and that the ministry should take care not to become another white space where Black students have to "be in resistance."

In *A Cry of Hope, A Call to Action*, Gilmer, the founder of the Impact Ministry, noted that (then) Campus Crusade's goal of integrating the various racial communities within it was admirable, but by not giving them spaces to themselves, they were being left without support and

understanding for the unique challenges they face, and risked implying that the distinct spiritual community of Black evangelicalism is somehow illegitimate. He also took part in founding parallel efforts for Asian-American students (Epic), and Hispanic students (Destino.) Notably, if a future Impact Ministry at UIUC were to be run like Valor (for military veterans), its members would not be isolated from the rest of Cru, still taking part in the large group meetings and group activities. They would not be isolated, they would just have a space of respite from their constant battle.

This indicates a potential problem with InterVarsity's approach: by emphasizing the value of learning through diversity despite the stress it can put on members from marginalized groups, one could argue that it is placing the edification of its white members ahead of the comfort of its members of color. But on the other hand, InterVarsity has a better chance of avoiding marginalizing and delegitimizing black students because more of their members are people of color, so the conditions that encouraged the formation of Impact Ministries over in Cru are not in place there. The question then becomes what type of group better serves a ministry's members of color; the answer is far beyond the scope of this study, but this tension points to the way each ministry can benefit from having other ministries with different interests and approaches on campus. As Gilmer indicates, Black students have a range of relationships with the majority culture in the United States, and some will be more comfortable in mixed or predominantly white spaces than others. If Dale is able to get an Impact Ministry running at UIUC, then young Black Christian students coming to the school will have the choice to get mixed into InterVarsity, join a specialized ministry for Black students, or see what any of the other ministries on campus have to offer, assuming that their options are clearly communicated. They will be able to partake of whichever environment they believe will serve them better.

Extending cultural bridging beyond the nation's borders, both ministries engage in mission trips, covered below. InterVarsity is more open about their desire to bridge between the Christians of different cultures in their week-to-week teaching. They frequently welcome and acknowledge international students, and their sermons explicitly broach the subject of contact between different cultures. Also, while their worship team draws from a very similar pool of Christian songs to Cru's, they sometimes switch to singing in other languages, most often Spanish or Korean. The worship team leader explained that this was to communicate that white, English-speaking, American Christians didn't own Christianity, and that there were faith communities all over the world every bit as valid and vibrant as the one here, now.

But what of places that they deem to lack such communities?

Between Nations

Meeting-by-meeting, InterVarsity spends significant effort in getting members to think of themselves as part of a worldwide tapestry of peoples and cultures who are all subject to Jesus. Their diverse membership is a point of pride, and they emphasize that faith in Jesus belongs to the world, not just the US. As noted in chapter 1, one of the ways they do this is by leading members in songs in other languages, a practice they carry with them into the All Campus Worship. However, engaging in mission work – traveling to other countries to proselytize and offer aid – is a major calling in both ministries.

While mission trip opportunities are frequently announced, Cru has an annual "international partnership night" that focuses entirely on the opportunity to go overseas and spread the word. The one that fell during my fieldwork focused on their missions in "East Asia" (they

refrain from overtly naming China for "security reasons[8]"), and the city of Split in Croatia. Split is an interesting case because the city is overwhelmingly Catholic, and yet we were told that this beautiful city was missing "one thing that you can offer: Jesus." A returning missionary described the culture as tradition-bound and nationalistic, with people practicing their faith for the "wrong reasons." This ties back into the basic diagnosis of the campus ministries, particularly their insistence that lukewarm, legalistic faith – in the case of Split, they object to the idea of "earning" forgiveness, rather than accepting it and starting the personal relationship with Jesus outlined in their prognosis. (According to the missionary, some of the Croatians he met talked about grappling with feelings of national insignificance, so even simply going there as Americans and taking an interest helps to spread the Gospel. I would be interested in hearing about this from them.)

The religious situation in China is very different, but a missionary skyping in from across the Pacific takes a similar line there. He described a culture with many virtues, including the importance of family, hard work, and honesty. The praise that they offer seems calculated to keep prospective missionaries from thinking of themselves as saviors, and prime them to travel with the expectation that they will have as much to learn as they will have to teach. Another argument against members lauding themselves is the repeated reminder that they are not themselves convincing anyone – that Jesus can work through them, if He so chooses. Rather than swaying unenlightened people with superior reasoning or charisma, missionaries are instead offering a hand to intelligent, curious people who are themselves searching. However, without access to the people they meet, and having a very difficult time finding accounts of Cru or IVCF missionaries from the

[8] This seems like a strange measure, but foreign missionaries seem to be included in the unsanctioned church activities that the Chinese government regularly takes action against (Vanderklippe 2014, BBC 2018), so they are deliberately vague about the location to avoid getting their contacts in trouble. Cru does not even officially acknowledge a presence in China (Cru Locations 2019), but nobody I interviewed was confused about where "East Asia" missionaries were going.

perspective of anyone other than themselves, I cannot say whether these humbling tactics are effective.

Online materials advising members about mission trip opportunities mostly frame the trips in terms of what they can do for the members, building the trips up as golden opportunities to learn about the culture they are traveling to, God, and themselves (InterVarsity G 2018, Cru 2018 B.) One point that I saw at the international partnership meeting that does not come up in the web articles and videos advertising these opportunities is that Cru and InterVarsity members have many valid reasons *not* to go, including the disruption that it can cause to their course through college, expenses, and feeling called to other tasks. (The InterVarsity website even asks, "Why not?", as though the answers were not obvious.) The speakers at that meeting wanted to ensure that the people who come are all in, and ready for the difficulties that they might face. (IVCF F 2018)

Ultimately, the meetings on campus are aimed at building the foundation of the bridge on this side, and the work of finding people to bridge *to* and reaching out to them is left to the missionaries to carry out person-by-person. Just as their prognosis is highly individual, the bridges that they emphasize are not between the organization of Cru and the people of Split or "East Asia," but rather between Cru members and individuals that they meet there, drawn through Jesus rather than any specific ministry – a connection that is both more personal than an organizational frame can be and larger than a registered student organization can claim. Chapter 6 will cover some of the deeper instruction for proselytization offered to members in more detail.

These are not the only countries that Cru focuses on; for instance, a sister ministry called *One for Israel* was founded with its support, and seeks to spread evangelicalism in Israel. This sort of bridging by fragmenting into more ministries is beyond the scope of this study, but it is important to acknowledge because Cru's focus is not as narrow as this particular group's attention

for Split and an unnamed city in China. Other chapters focus on different places, and they abet and encourage other ministries that focus in yet more. (The existence of One for Israel also offers a partial explanation for why it seems like Cru does not proselytize to Jews, and treats them in sermons and articles as historical characters, rather than people who exist in the world today.) (OFI 2018)

Smoothing and Bridging

Smoothing tactics are thematically similar to frame bridging insofar as they present two different frames and set about to negotiate the differences between them, but this analysis reveals three important differences between smoothing and bridging, at least as they manifest in campus ministries.

1) Bridging does not necessarily imply a hierarchy, though it can, such as in the case of mission trips. In bridging, the two frames are being fused or connected to make a stronger whole, while smoothing is undertaken with the idea that one will supplant the other. Even when the object is to convert other people to a new religion, campus ministries try to emphasize what their members can learn from the people they are proselytizing to. This does not erase the implied hierarchy of that particular form of bridging, but it is presented with a less absolute tone than the hierarchy between a past and present framing. InterVarsity, especially, calls upon members to take joy in the different forms that Christianity can take all over the world, as their faith is blended into foreign cultures instead of replacing them.

2) Bridging is more likely to have an "us" and a "you," taking place between two distinct groups (even as loosely defined as "adherents and non-adherents.") Smoothing is concerned with "us" – both of the frames under consideration belong to the same group. Sometimes, when the

split is contentious enough, it can *create* factions as some are not convinced, but in the contentious recent case here, it looks like the people who did not agree with IVCF's stance on same sex attraction just fell away.

3) Time is important in smoothing – the two frames are "old" and "new," whereas frames being bridged can coexist. It is possible to conceptualize bridging as having a similar arc across time, with the combined frame serving as the "new," but that generally is not the focus of the practice. In this way, smoothing can be deployed to support frame bridging when it requires changes from the SMO members; for instance, Hayden's call for a multiethnic ministry above could support the efforts of both IVCF and Cru to build bridges between the different racial communities within the evangelical faith, outlining what is required of white congregants in particular if they want to build that bridge. However, in the campus ministry meetings, I did not often observe smoothing tactics overtly deployed in this way.

Future work that delves into the ways that frame smoothing manifests in different types of movements will no doubt serve to refine the relationship between these theoretical concepts. For now, they are bound and similar, but distinct practices that serve different functions for the campus ministries.

Reframing Identities with an Audience

As identity is an important part of social movement organizations' strategies (Bernstein 1997), frame transformations that are aimed at defining or redefining who gets framed as one of their relevant identities (e.g. "evangelical," "Christian," or "member of IVCF") are particularly risky and delicate operations, requiring careful smoothing and presentation to the broader public.

This is best illustrated by two of our major examples from InterVarsity: the purge of LGBT-supporting members, and the call for multiethnic ministry.

As calls for change that pointed out perceived deficiencies within InterVarsity, both cases had something surprising in common: while SMOs will frequently try to present a unified front to outsiders while working out their internal schisms quietly (Polletta and Jasper 2001), both of these calls for transformation were public, with an audience of anyone who cared to pay attention. Both could potentially drive wedges through the faith community (or at least give the appearance of doing so) and make it look worse to outsiders, and from the reaction of former members and outsiders (Lin 2016), the purge did. In part, this is a matter of necessity; InterVarsity had changed its policy nationwide, and could hardly hope to keep outsiders from noticing and making comment. Meanwhile, Hayden's call came in a general membership meeting open to the general public – but then, it was a call for more than just IVCF members. In this case, if her call made the community look worse, it was only by revealing the flaws that she was calling out.

The publicity of both of these calls may have been more than a regrettable necessity, though. As my interviews with the directors of both ministries revealed, there are times when a unified front may not be the best look. If Cru were to accept an appearance of unbroken homogeneity and unity, it would appear to onlookers as a white enclave, and Director Dale was keen to avoid both the appearance and the reality. Meanwhile, InterVarsity might be more diverse, but still risked creating an environment where Black members were required to suppress their identities to get along with white members. If avoiding either of these fates invites some conflict or discomfort within the movement, then it might be better to be seen fighting it out than to be seen relaxing in a position of privilege. As for InterVarsity's purge, the reason that it was carried out in the first place was that IVCF had, for decades, not strictly policed the aspects of its collective

identity based on its theological stance on human sexuality, and now members are expected to bring their own identities into line, or find ministries that serve them better. The leadership of IVCF had decided that the change was worth the confusion, heartbreak, and bad press that rolling it out would cause.

These two cases show that changes in SMO framing can act to broaden or narrow the pool of members, in this case expanding to embrace all races, or narrowing to exclude people who are accepting of same-sex attraction. While this chapter has primarily focused on frame smoothing tactics as a way to retain members through a change, the purge presents us with at least one case where smoothing may be a matter of convincing members to leave without causing too much discord or instability on their way out.

Conclusion – Bridges in Time and Space

One of the major contributions of frame alignment theory was to recognize the agency of potential adherents and explore the reasons that they have for either joining up with a social movement or failing to. Including frame smoothing tactics in the theory allows us a way to avoid treating them as though they lost their agency when they have finally signed on. They do not become a part of homogenous social movement unit, and the reasons that the organization's framing appealed to them remain. Just as an organization or movement's framing is not static, nor is the participation of any given member.

As the analysis in this chapter is based on a short course of fieldwork, it may not have been ideal for capturing the intricacies of smoothing tactics. Ideally, future work looking to refine the concept will either take on a more longitudinal shape, or take a deep dive into historical records. One question in particular that this study leaves open is whether the use or choice of particular

smoothing tactics can act to alter the content of an SMO's framing. As discussed in chapter 4, it is important to acknowledge unexpected relationships between the different aspects of framing, which may be revealed by spending more time with smoothing.

This is only an introduction, and frame smoothing tactics still have some growing to do as a theoretical concept. But there is no shortage of places to look, and much to gain by doing so.

Chapter 6 – The Chisel and the Bullhorn: Introducing Frame Detailing

InterVarsity meetings take place in a warm room gently lit by Christmas lights. It's a large space perched high above Green Street, but only barely big enough for the groups that gather, rendering it cozy or cramped, depending on the attendee's mood. Members sit in rows shoulder-to-shoulder with their fellows, with the front row mere feet from a stage that's barely shin-high. The environment puts members on a level with speakers and performers in a way Cru's bright, open meeting space does not, and makes their regular altar calls all the more effective – and affecting. An "altar call" is an evangelical tradition wherein attendees of a service are called to dedicate or rededicate their lives to Jesus with a formal prayer, either by coming forward to the altar (though this space lacked one), or privately, from their seat. The leader of the worship team (the band), informed us in a gentle, earnest voice that we could invite Jesus into our heart privately, or come to him or one of the volunteers spaced around the room.

To my faint surprise, few people did, wandering and filtering to the edges of the room to talk softly with InterVarsity staffers and volunteers. But then, I could feel it, too; every cue was urging us to take a step forward into something warm and wonderful – or, in the case of those rededicating, a step *back* into a fold they were feeling distant from. I looked down at my hands on my knees, wondering if the display would have the same effect on someone who didn't grow up going to churches that spoke like evangelicals, or listening to praise music like the worship team had been playing, now fading to gently plucking out the chorus. Qualitatively, it was a profoundly different experience from inspecting a diagram outlining GCF's mission, or arguing out a minor point of scriptural interpretation in Ken and Mae's apartment, yet all of these activities, and others yet more different, performed the functions of frame amplification.

In frame-alignment theory, frame amplification was initially defined as "the clarification and invigoration of an interpretive frame that bears on a particular issue, problem, or set of events,"

(Snow et al. 1986) but it was not long until it got focused into "accenting and highlighting some issues, events, or beliefs as being more salient than others." (Benford and Snow 1988).

The next section will introduce the concept of *frame detailing*, which can also serve to clarify and invigorate a frame, but does so using different methods from amplification – particularly detailed discussions of procedure, careful apologetics that counter anticipated counterarguments, and open discussions where questions are fielded and answered by leaders, members, and potential members. The section after will explore the various tactics of frame amplification that the campus ministries engage in, as past literature has presented the concept, in order to show how the processes complement one another. The final section will explore some of the benefits that frame detailing as a concept can offer to the study of social movements, and point out some potential future sites to investigate it in.

The Chisel – Frame Detailing

Frame detailing is a discursive practice based on making dense, detailed accounts of an SMO's framing available to potential adherents or longtime members and helping them to understand its deeper intricacies. The name refers to these intricacies, as members were likely already aware of the broad strokes of the organization's framing, but may have more to learn.[9] This section will go through each of the three types (procedure, apologetics, and exploration) in turn, discussing how they are performed and what they accomplish, and sharing examples of each in the activities of the campus ministries, before showing some of the ways that they can be used

[9] Elaboration, extension, and expansion all might have worked as a name for this concept, but they were all taken to describe different processes. I settled on "detailing" from the image of an artist filling the broad strokes of a carving in with fine details, resulting in an image that is much more complex and has more texture. The idea of "texture" is a minor theme in this analysis, as the details can give frames a surface that members can grip more firmly – or a rough surface that grates at them or other frames they are invested in.

in accord. Then, it will delve into some of the general functions and risks of frame detailing as a whole.

While frame detailing can serve a similar purpose to existing implementations of the frame amplification concept by clarifying a movement's aims and reinvigorating members' investment, detailing does so by working in the opposite direction. Instead of presenting only small, easily remembered bits, it presents members with the expanse of the SMO's frame and confronts them with potential contradictions, complications, and nuances. Instead of carefully directing the potential adherent's attention, it gives them room to wander and potentially get lost. However, frame detailing is not mutually exclusive with amplification; the examples outlined in this section are all interwoven with various forms of frame amplification, including emotional appeals, selective emphasis, and clarifying summaries.

While detailing often involves clarifying pre-determined aspects of a social movement organization's framing, but it can sometimes be an act of creation, as well. If presented with a situation that they have not been specifically instructed for, either because the problem stems from a new development, or the composers of the existing frame simply does not cover it, SMO members may have to "fill in" a congruent explanation or course of action in order to maintain the integrity of their framing. Across many chapters of a nationwide organization, the answers to these questions may turn out to be inconsistent, but they can still collectively help members to maintain their investment.

The Types of Detailing in Brief

This subsection is a brief summation of the types of frame detailing that I identified in the field, while the following subsections will offer empirical examples of each. It is likely that future

studies will need to modify the concepts for different settings and contexts, but this is the classification system that fit the concepts as I observed them in campus ministries. The descriptions will sometimes refer to a "facilitator," which is simply the person who is carrying the process out for the benefit of others in the interaction – the person who is explaining procedure, or writing an article that argues in favor of the SMO's positions, or leading a discussion on the finer points of its framing. Often, this will be a person in a position of leadership or seniority granted by the organization, but in other cases, ground-level members or even visitors will get the chance to facilitate. The third type, exploration, allows the facilitator role to be passed around by design.

Procedural Frame Detailing involves instructing members on defined procedures for actions that the SMO wants them to carry out, either on its behalf or on their own. It can encompass either short, simple actions that can carry weight collectively, or complex procedures that require investment, focus, and effort from members. In either case, the procedure offers a way for members to take concrete action to support the organization's framing, growing in confidence and investment. In terms of the core framing tasks, procedural frame detailing is primarily focused on prognostic framing, though, as this is a spiritual movement, many times a member's own thoughts and motivations will become a part of the procedure (e.g. a member should center themselves before witnessing to a nonbeliever and make sure that they're not treating the person like a target to hit or a prize to be won.)

Apologetic Frame Detailing presents members with thorough justifications or explanations for the stances or actions of the social movement. Apologetics engage potential criticisms or concerns that opponents of the organization's framing might raise, and seeks to refute them. This serves a double purpose, as the facilitator is making their argument directly to the adherent or potential adherent, seeking to convince them or strengthen their conviction in the SMO's framing

by revealing its armor against potential attacks, but the adherent is also being equipped to deal with arguments that they may encounter far beyond the facilitator's sight. In this way, apologetic motivational framing mainly fills the task of motivational framing, but can become prognostic when members encounter challenges to their framing. The simplest form involves directly bringing up an argument that opposes the SMO's framing and then presenting a counterargument, but facilitators can operate more subtly by anticipating counterarguments and pre-empting them without directly presenting the conflict. (An example of this subtler form of apologetics from the previous chapter would be the speaker from IVCF emphasizing their stance that LGBT individuals are not uniquely sinful or deficient, in an effort to head off the argument that the ministry is prejudiced against them.)

Exploratory Frame Detailing, as the name suggests, allows members to learn about the SMO's framing in a more unstructured way. Exploration's primary difference from the other two types of frame detailing is that it starts with a question – either posed by the facilitator or to them – and either way, they may not have a specific answer in mind. All three types of detailing can be modes of instruction, but this one leaves the facilitator open to instruction as well. Exploration can reveal any of the three core framing tasks, depending on how the conversation goes, but its intersection with motivational framing is particularly notable because it gives members a chance to share and interrogate the aspects of the organization's framing that are most important and compelling to them, or lay to rest difficulties that keep them from investing more deeply.

While the empirical examples this section presents emphasize frame detailing in longer and more involved forms in order to make its interplay with frame amplification clearer, facilitators do not always need to present it in the form of an essay or deep discussion. Sometimes the space that needs to be filled is small, and can be brushed past in a sentence or two. Shorter forms can

overlap with frame amplification, as with a Cru member's cheerful advice that we were on the quad to "convert, not flirt!" That phrase has stayed lodged in my mind since that spring day, but people in SMOs also present members with advice in forms other than catchy summations, such as Liam's advice to avoid people who look busy, approach politely, and give contact information rather than taking it.

The three types can blend together, such as a discussion of the best way to tackle a complex problem blending procedural and exploratory detailing, or, as frequently happens in campus ministries, when members receive detailed instructions in how to defend the SMO's position against common counterarguments. For the purposes of this chapter, I have erred towards classifying the more didactic examples of detailing that I encountered in large group meetings as procedural or apologetic, and the cases of detailing that I took part in in bible studies as exploratory. This is a qualitative distinction; as anyone in the bible study group could have spoken up to steer the discussion in a direction that they were interested in, strident defenses of Cru or GCF and prescriptive outlines of steps we should take would generally fall by the wayside.

Finally, frame detailing does not have to be the whole of any discussion, sermon, talk, article, or story it figures into. The Dates sermon above moved through many different frame alignment processes; the oblique defense of the conservative Christian stance on sexual morality was only a small – but significant – part of it.

Procedural Detailing

Before he became a preacher, Bill Bright was a businessman, and he brought his business acumen into the evangelical world, carefully honing a "sales pitch" to employ in witnessing to bring nonbelievers into the fold. He and his staff developed a wide range of tools for this purpose,

including a pamphlet ("Would You Like to Know God Personally?") that has hardly changed over the decades before we passed them out to our fellow students in the 2016 *Storm the Quad* event. Drilling Cru (then Campus Crusade) members in a singular pitch rather than letting them witness in a more spontaneous and personal way seemed crass at the time (and InterVarsity members were not shy about pointing it out), but it got results, and as the famous televangelist Billy Graham said, "I am selling the greatest product in the world; why shouldn't it be sold as well as soap?" (Turner 2008)

However, when I observed Cru members "in action" at events such as *Storm the Quad* and bringing friends to meetings, I saw that they were still willing to personalize their approach and pay attention to the individual circumstances of the people they approach for recruitment. Jordan, an undergraduate member of Cru, shared his inclination to let others bring up spiritual matters before sharing his own thoughts, while Shae noted that gaining the courage to "step out" and witness (a term for relating the Gospel to nonbelievers) more assertively was one of the benefits of her membership. Just because a procedure is laid out for members of an SMO does not mean that they will all robotically follow it in the same way – the procedures in this case are tools. In her discussion of discipleship, Jane, a staff member with the Cru affiliate Bridges International, explained her relationship with the procedures that Cru offers for lessons: "I think it's cool, because, the guides we use at Bridges give us one topic at a time, and an example verse we can talk about, so that gives us freedom to talk about whatever we want on that topic. I think it's helpful, sometimes, to know what I can do with a student, but I think, as time goes on, there's even more freedom than that. When I was a student, sometimes my discipler would come in with a specific lesson, but other times, it would just be, 'what do you want to learn about?'"

Procedural frame detailing is often carried out with the understanding and expectation that this is how defined procedures will be received. *3 Modes of Evangelism* is a bite-sized video, but it describes a classification of different ways to "witness," – natural witness, or carrying the Gospel to people the member already knows, ministry witness, going out and carrying the word to strangers, and body witness, which involves creating a loving community of Christ-followers for others to see and experience (Davy 2018). While a given member is likely to have inclinations towards one or another type, they are urged to be versatile. Likewise, a common theme across interviews was the variety of ways that members could choose to serve, and the hope that the ministry would make sure to have a place for all different kinds of members. Discipleship is at least partially a means of meeting every member where they are and tailoring their participation to their talents and desires, but even if they do not have a mentor, members are presented with a wide variety of options for volunteering, teaching, and learning.

As covered in chapter 4, the incredibly broad sweep of campus ministries enables them to engage in procedural frame detailing in topics that would seem to have little to do with their mission; many of the articles cited there to demonstrate frame extension (e.g. McReynolds 2015, Tripp 2018) were also examples of frame detailing because they were instructing members in the approved Christian way to handle these topics. The wide range of subjects that ministries can cover also means that members who don't have experience or seniority within the SMO can still engage in procedural frame dealing when the procedure falls into some area they have experience in. Even I did so, briefly, as I fumbled through some relationship advice to a younger member in an effort to explain why he shouldn't start dating a girl of another religion with the goal of converting her to Christianity. "How would you feel if you found out she only said yes because she wanted to change your faith, and invite you into Hinduism?" I asked, repeatedly glancing to

the group leader. "It's not something you want as the basis of your relationship." More involved advice for relationship building was implicit in my detailing, but ultimately, I was offering him a very simple procedure: don't.

Bright also brought to Cru many individual-scale devotions and practices that were disseminated throughout the organization to help believers in their daily lives, such as "spiritual breathing" and "throne checks." Spiritual breathing is a simple exercise where the believer draws in God's grace with their breath, reflects on a recent sin or failing, accepts God's forgiveness and give Him back control, then exhale the impurity. A throne check comes when an adherent simply stops everything and ask themselves, "Is this what God wants me to be doing?" (Richardson 2000) Such practices are handy adaptations for living in a society that is not overtly organized around the church, simple devotions a member can perform within their body as they go about their worldly business. When they become habit, they can offer a sense of security and direction, and reinforce the nature of the evangelical frame as encompassing every aspect of believers' lives. When I asked members of Cru about these practices, they did not know the names or who had devised them, but recognized the practices themselves.

Carrying this spirit forward, Cru and InterVarsity offer daily devotionals that include verses to read, lessons to ponder, and an "action point" to try during the day, though IVCF's are harder to find without spending money at InterVarsity Press. Reading a verse and taking a single simple action or encouraging a single thought might not seem worthy of the name "procedure," but it becomes one as you continue to follow the devotions day after day. With this, we can see that apart from making sure that members make the right moves at events or when acting on the movement's behalf, procedural frame detailing can also encourage them to make the movement a part of their day-to-day lives and identity.

One cold Friday night, InterVarsity brought in a pastor to explain to us how to pray. Isn't prayer the simplest thing in the world? But he laid out all of the ways that we were doing it wrong, including treating God like a genie who will just give us what we want, being "foul-weather friends," mindlessly following formulae, or irreverently forgetting that this was a personal, direct, and instant communication with the ruler of the universe. His sermon was a thorough guide on how to direct our thoughts and desires towards praying in a way that was pleasing to God, and would help us to serve Him. The evening ended with a prayer night; the Loft was left open for those who wished to stay all night, with a "prayer wall" available to write requests on, a variety of guides for praying on various subjects, and the stage opened for quiet artistic expression. Even through gentle piped music, the ambience became quiet and intense as those members who stayed put effort into "staying in God's face," as the pastor put it, all night. Here we see a detailed procedure for actions that we normally think of as deeply personal, individual, and private. If members take the pastor up on his advice, IVCF will have taken a role in defining some of the most quiet and personal moments of their lives as Christians.

Procedural frame detailing conveys the "nuts and bolts" of participation to members. However, similar to Cru's emphasis on bullet points and checklists above, an analysis that focuses on procedure alone can be misleading. "Cru can be pretty structured," Shae agreed, but later added, "I don't look at it like a checklist, and I don't think we should. And I think sometimes it can become like that – because I'm very involved in that, I love Cru, I want to serve at capacity." Cru's framing in particular is caught in this tension – the desire to efficiently convey important ideas and produce results, set against the imperative to understand and experience their relationship with God and connect with the people they witness to on a human level. While focusing entirely on procedure would be making the mistake Shae warned of, in smaller doses, procedural detailing

can ease this tension by allowing speakers to unspool the lists and procedures, explain them, and invite members to ponder and imagine each point, turning it into more than a bloodless set of steps to follow.

Apologetic Detailing

The simplest form of apologetic frame detailing consists of straightforwardly telling a reader, listener, or interlocutor about an argument, challenge, or question against the SMO's framing that they may encounter, and explaining why it is wrong. They can range from small matters like the article "0% Alcohol, 100% Jesus," (Cru A 2018) which tackles the question of what to say when your friends ask why you don't engage in underage drinking, and presents the best case scenario of honestly saying, "I don't because it distracts from my relationship with God" piquing the curiosity of the other party and leading to further discussions. They can also be more damning arguments, such as the acknowledged sin and hypocrisy of the evangelical establishment in "Why I Still Have Hope for Evangelicalism" (Lin 2018), which argues that, despite its failing, global evangelicalism can still inspire believers in the midst of our "American malaise."

Sometimes the lesson is presented as a story, rather than a guide. At the All Campus Worship, the Reverend Charlie Dates' account of his encounter with the mayor of Chicago would be another example: "What does it matter, who loves who?" This is a question that any believer who takes the conservative evangelical line on the issues surrounding LGBT individuals can face, and Charlie Dates's whole sermon was an impassioned answer, outlining his Christian conception of love as existing beyond our ability to control or define it. Ideally (from his perspective), listeners will come to understand and accept this idea of love, and one of the benefits of his sermon will be that they are now armored against that type of challenge. Topics that come up rarely in

meetings, such as Hell and sexuality, are most often approached through the medium of apologetics. The very aspects that make them risky for frequent discussion also make them likely vectors of attack from opponents and skeptics.

Apologetics need not be preparing adherents for an ideological battle with nonbelievers, however. Sometimes, the problem is doubt or fear. For instance, Sarah's mentees are mostly international students who are under a lot of stress in a new culture, so the first stop in their discipleship is a lesson on, "How do I know I'm saved?", explaining the rationale for the evangelical notion of a relationship with Christ, and why it cannot be taken from you. Intellectual doubts can be assuaged with such explanations as well – for instance, for members of Cru who think that their procedures for evangelism are too mechanical, they might be directed to, "Why have Evangelism Strategies?" (Swanson 2018), which explains the imperative of the Great Commission and how the strategies Cru has developed over the decades aid in meeting it. While making apologetics include any detailed account of an organization's framing would likely stretch the concept into uselessness, it is important to acknowledge that such accounts can serve an apologetic *function* by increasing the confidence of members and filling out their understanding.

In Cru's undergraduate bible studies under both Jed and Ray, the lessons we took were often designed to firm our faith and prepare us for a world that wasn't ready for it. (Possibly owing to their format, outlined in the next subsection, the Cru graduate bible study and the GCF bible study rarely presented apologetics.)

Preparations for these attacks can be intricate and prescriptive enough to function as procedural detailing. Since spreading and defending this message to others is so important in the ministries' prognostic frame, apologetic and procedural frame detailing may have more overlap for them than in other types of organizations. InterVarsity's *Conversation Stoppers* series (IVCF

C 2018), presents a long list of arguments that can stop any attempt at witnessing cold, such as "Christianity is patriarchal and sexist," or "A loving God wouldn't send people to Hell." Rather than just giving counterarguments, it is primarily concerned with keeping the conversation going and ensuring that the believer isn't left floundering. The way it accomplishes this is by supplying an arsenal of questions to either put the other party on the defensive or just find out why they feel the way they do, depending on how cynically the reader interprets the instructions. If all goes well, the conversation could become a learning experience for both members, and result in the third form of frame detailing: exploration.

Exploratory Detailing

This mode of frame detailing primarily took place in the bible study groups, where members had more space to speak up and interact. Both GCF and the graduate Cru bible study started with a list of questions about a particular passage of the Bible that we would read together, and basically the whole session was made up of us discussing the questions one after another. While the leaders in both cases had answers of their own, and sometimes specific points that they wanted to make, the goal of the exercise was for the groups to come up with answers better than any one of us would have come in with – or sometimes deeper questions. "What are parables {the stories that Jesus would tell} for?" Answers included "adding interest," "allowing for ambiguity," "provoking thought and debate," "making the lesson less immediate and more general," and more. All potentially correct! All lenses that we would be able to approach those chapters of Luke, and all of our future Bible studies through. On another night, an innocuous chapter of Acts led us into a discussion of whether Christians can be comfortable, or if faith was a call to confront injustice and not prioritize ourselves. Very rarely did we come to a definite conclusion, but that may have

been by design – in the case of fellow grad students, such discussions usually resulted in members quietly reconsidering, revising, and adjusting. Both ministries are on the record as encouraging debate (Steiner 2004, IVCF E 2004), but in my experience direct arguments were rare.

Apart from formal instruction, exploration in the ministries can take the form of lifting concerns up in prayer. The format for lifting concerns of members up in prayer was the same in both ministries. Starting at an arbitrary point, we would go around the room, with each person volunteering both a concern that they have, and a "praise" – something that makes them feel grateful, and that they wish to praise God for. This procedure was standard between ministries, and all of the bible study groups I attended followed it, though not especially strictly. This was particularly the case in GCF, where conversations, clarifying questions, and playful ribbing could last much longer than the prayer itself. (We also had a running gag of Ken trying to convince someone else to do the eventual prayer and falling back into it, but sometimes others helped him out.)

As we discussed the problems and joys revealed in our prayers, this presented opportunities to give members bits of instruction and/or workshop solutions. (For example, in meeting after meeting Soo Min would ask us to pray to help her gather the courage it show her face in the social work department, until eventually Ken said, "We'll keep praying, but sooner or later, you have to just do it.") Of course, lifting up the concerns of members in prayer serves a variety of functions beyond instruction. It helped us to get to know each other and build solidarity and fellowship by sharing the concerns that bedeviled us and the good fortune we were enjoying. It also situated our experiences, hopes, and fears in relation to the evangelical master frame of living for a God who takes interest in every aspect of our lives. The ministries' endless frame extension reached even here; no matter what the concern, at least among those members felt comfortable enough to share,

there was a place for it before the throne of God. At no point during my fieldwork did anybody consult ministry materials to determine the proper response to a prayer request or praise, and rarely was the Bible directly quoted or cited in these discussions, but given that the discussions were happening at the end of an hour of bible study, the day's lessons were at the front of our minds.

This type of frame detailing enables members to raise questions about the premises and understandings of their movement's framing, and reveal points of disagreement and friction. As Ken is an English grad student, the GCF bible studies that he and Mae ran were open to approaching the Bible as a work of literature; while the group still held it to be the Word of God, they were willing to discuss the motivations and cultural contexts of specific authors, and consider both metaphor and storytelling conventions. As we marched through the book of Luke, it came to light that the story of Jesus calming the stormy sea was strange because, as a small inland sea, the Sea of Galilee was not very threatening,[10] but instead of defending the calming of the storm as a literal event, the group turned to the question of, "Why did Luke write the story this way, then? What point was he trying to make?"

An InterVarsity large-group meeting on how faith interacts with mental illness and cultural conflicts demonstrated that exploration is not limited to small, intimate groups. The speaker, Kathy Khang, recognized that it could be awkward to speak up in a public setting, so she shared a number that attendees could text their questions to, and she spent some time answering questions like, "Does depression hinder your relationships?" and "How can we confront this issue in the Asian-American church?" (The answer to this last involved a call for trailblazers, as well as shifting the church culture, Asian-American and beyond, into one where members can share "dirty

[10] I later learned that this impression may have been mistaken, but the response of the group – to accept new information and change the course of their exploration accordingly – was still telling.

laundry.") This allowed for less back-and-forth, as questioners weren't able to easily follow up, but still allowed those concerned or interested to guide the sermon for a while.

The benefits of this mode of frame detailing are matched by risks, as the usual facilitator is releasing a degree of control to a collection of members and visitors who may be of varying levels of engagement and investment in the movement and its goals. (After all, they were giving *me* a chance to raise questions.) This includes the possibility of disruption or contributions made in bad faith, which I did not see in any of the bible study groups I attended, with the possible exception of a joke about cannibalism that got out of hand and had to be shut down by Mae. More likely, groups can get "lost in the weeds," drawn into topics that are at best tangential to the reason they gather, such as the exact nature and limitations of Jesus's ability to heal. (Reading closely, it looks like Jesus has to rest after healing people, and can't do it all the time. Fascinating to fantasy readers like Ken and myself, but angels dancing on the heads of pins for all the insight it gave us into the book of Luke or the Bible as a whole.)

Meanwhile, Jed, the leader of the Cru bible study for undergrads, ran a tighter ship. As noted in chapter 4, just as GCF and the graduate chapter at Cru echoed the feeling of a graduate seminar by giving members the ability and responsibility to generate much of the study's content, Jed ran his meetings more like an undergraduate discussion section. His group meetings were more shot through with procedure and apologetics – rather than just a set of questions, as in the GCF group, he had a set of lessons he wanted to convey, such as reminding us not to threaten nonbelievers with Hell and encouraging us to think of Cru as a mere vessel, unimportant in itself. We always had time to speak up, but we never had time to get lost before the next point came up.

This is not the only way multiple types of frame detailing can fit together.

Multiple Types in Accord

Much like the different types of frame amplification, different types of frame detailing are not mutually exclusive. First, and most directly, different types of framing and frame detailing can become a matter of procedure themselves. Both Cru and InterVarsity offer voluminous materials on how to run large and small groups (e.g. IVCF D 2018, Cru D 2018), and leaders are encouraged again and again to avoid making themselves the center – to lead by asking questions and inviting members to speak up. However, as Graham observed, the culture of different ministries and even of different small groups within the same ministry is very different. Once again, even as they follow the recommended procedure, members vary widely in execution, from Jed's calm experience to Ray's mild guidance to Ken and Mae's odd humor.

As noted above, advice on how to proselytize to nonbelievers is both procedural and apologetic in nature, equipping readers with arguments and offering instruction in their use, and, because the evangelist is assumed to be showing a human interest in their subject, the projected best course for these encounters to take is exploration. In the act of "witnessing," the centerpiece and end-point of the campus ministries' prognostic frames, all three types of frame detailing align – by following the ministry's guidance, members seek to justify its existence and bring knowledge to believers, nonbelievers, and themselves alike. (Or, at least, they get to have a pleasant conversation and don't scare anyone away.)

Different forms of detailing can also be carried out in sequence, instead of being combined. For instance, to follow up on the "modes of evangelism" instructional video cited above has a follow-up article consisting of a collection of discussion questions to get a small group talking about how they might witness (or fail to) in their daily lives. (Cru B 2018) This is similar to Jed's method for guiding the bible study above; using a specific lesson and prompt to guide the

discussion, though in an SMO with meetings that take a different format than a study group, different kinds of guidance would likely be necessary.

Other Functions

One of the clearest indirect functions of frame detailing is that it can project sophistication and confidence, particularly when it is coupled with effective frame amplification so that potential adherents don't have to carefully pick the main points out for themselves. It reveals a deeper rationale and understanding behind the basics of the framing. It also allows members to carry that confidence into their own activities on behalf of the SMO; having been thoroughly instructed and briefed, and can give them answers to the challenges they may meet in day-to-day life, whether from outsiders or blind circumstance. (This operates not only by supplying scripts and procedures to follow in different situations, but also by encouraging attitudes and emotions that are agreeable to the organization's goals.) It will also help them to stay "on message" in surprising or unexpected situations where simply repeating catchphrases would not convey a coherent worldview; both Cru and InterVarsity's extensive library of apologetics construct an understanding of their view of the world that members can come to understand, and then reveal when challenged.

More cynically, detailing can act to add appeal to a movement's framing that is incidental to its other priorities and goals. The practice of spiritual breathing, for instance, which involves deliberately slowing one's breath down and summoning calming imagery (inhaling forgiveness, exhaling sin) bears a strong resemblance to some secular breathing exercises, which can act to reduce anxiety and depression even absent any supernatural element. (Wilkinson et al 2002) As noted in chapter 4's account of frame extension, much of Cru and InterVarsity's spiritual advice is interwoven with simple, practical advice that could help you regardless of your spiritual

persuasion. It could be a sinister attempt to present the ability to pack for college (Ackman 2016) or manage one's finances after college (Moore 2016) as a boon from Christianity, or it could just be an effort to help young folks who look to them for guidance.[11]

Finally, detailing helps to maintain engagement among members who already know the basics by letting them learn more and put their knowledge to use in grappling with new ideas and helping to instruct their fellows. "You've got some of the people in that room who are just checking out Jesus for the first time, and I want to have something to say, 'this is how this connects to me,'" Director Dale explained. "But you got other people in there who are growing in their faith…mature leaders, staff…and I want something that they can walk away with, too!" A few of the veteran Cru members that I talked to have admitted that they do not always get a lot out of the large group sermons, in part because of how basic they can be, but enjoy discipleship and bible studies because it lets them get into the deeper intricacies of the Bible and how they should live their lives as Christians.

Chapter 4's analysis showed that Cru and InterVarsity are operating from a vast evangelical frame with enough content to fill meeting after meeting on content concerning any subject you could imagine and ambitions to cover every facet of human experience, but the ability to more deeply engage with a social movement organization's subject matter is a benefit even when their framing is narrower. While Jed was focusing on the Bible when he told us of the need to move on to meat after we're done with milk, an SMO has to offer instruction and discussion beyond sound

[11] Less cynically, the gulf in experience and years between Jed and most of his bible study members allowed him a perspective on their struggles, and he often spoke to them not as a spiritual authority but as an older guy. Why not be helpful, if you can? I did the same, strongly advising a younger member against dating a girl with the intention of proselytizing to her.

bites and bumper stickers if it wants members to be able to hold on to their convictions and act intelligently to further their goals without direct guidance.[12]

As noted above, a common theme in the bible studies of both ministries is members maturing in their faith, matching their growth as a student and an adult. A deep course of frame detailing, both in terms of more elaborate and complex instruction, and in offering members more autonomy and self-direction in their learning, contributes to a sense of growth, progression, and deeper understanding, and offers rewards independent of the SMO's broader goals.

General Risks of Detailing

While there are many benefits for SMOs that have a clear, thorough, and nuanced presentation of their framing handy, engaging in frame detailing carries risks beyond those specific to exploration. First, bluntly, frame detailing can be *boring*. At one GCF meeting, I learned of a lunch talk from a visiting speaker that had turned into a political diatribe and gone on far too long, and even the members who had agreed with its content came away feeling like the evening had not been worth their time. Most of the members present were invested, and knew this was not the norm, but one remarked that if that had been his first meeting, it would also have been his last. When Jordan told me that he had only learned of Cru's deeper strategies when he attended the winter conference, he may have been revealing a counter to this risk: those who were invested enough to spend money and travel out to attend were more likely to be interested in a course of frame detailing.

[12] It is possible to imagine a SMO that wants its members to constrict their understanding of the issues it bears on to a narrow band and never think about it in more detailed or nuanced terms than bumper stickers, but whether such movements have frame detailing, and what form it takes for them, is beyond the scope of this study.

Frame detailing can activate skepticism and resistance in potential adherents who would otherwise be sympathetic; for instance, in the 40s, the House Unamerican Activities Commission was able to paint a convincing and terrifying image of a Hollywood infested by Communist infiltrators specifically because it was not compelled to offer as many details (which would reveal holes in their story and open it to criticism) in its reports as a law-enforcement agency like the FBI would be forced to (Noakes 2005)[13]. A brief pitch or simple stance lets potential adherents fill in details that would be appealing to them, or fit that singular aspect of an SMO's framing into their own personal frames in the least discordant way possible.

For an example from our campus ministries, the notion that, through Jesus, God has justified humanity's sin and declared us innocent against all odds has fairly broad appeal; it makes sense that an all-loving God would not want to throw His beloved creations into a pit of eternal fire. The idea may become less appealing if you then point out that, at least according to Cru, this means that otherwise good people will be cast into Hell for not accepting Jesus. "Often, I am asked, 'How can a loving God send good people to hell?' When we begin to understand the reality of our situation, we realize that in fact the question is just the opposite: How can a just and righteous God grant innocence to truly guilty people?" (Vampatella 2012) Similarly, InterVarsity's "clarification" outlined in the previous chapter where they affirmed their stance on same-sex attraction, and urged anyone who did not agree to leave, was acknowledged as a move that would be painful for many members. If an SMO details a potentially controversial aspect of its framing, it must ensure that it is worth the dissonance they may suffer.

For social movement actors, this raises the ethical conundrum of whether to accept the support of adherents who might not continue to agree if an SMO's stances were clarified further,

[13] HUAC is not a social movement actor, but part of Noakes's argument in this paper was that non-social movement actors could take part in framing processes as well.

but, even with the addition of detailing, frame alignment theory can only highlight the issue and does not offer moral guidance on this front.

A personal anecdote from my research can illustrate these risks, as well. I seethed through the one Cru sermon I encountered that touched on the morality of same-sex attraction and whether or not to accept LGBT individuals, not only because of the initial assertion that same-sex attraction was a manifestation of the brokenness of the world, but because the speaker's explanation for *why* such identities were sinful was not at all convincing. He called upon us to reject teachers who tell us to "accept a morality less than biblical holiness" and borrow from the ideology of the day, positioning acceptance of same-sex attraction as a grave disserve to the people so afflicted, driven by conformity to the modern secular culture rather than compassion.

While members of Cru and InterVarsity both tend to avoid directly stating the anti-LGBT stance of their ministries, I was well aware of it. I just had an easy time looking to the aspects of their teaching that I liked until it was presented to me and expounded upon. And unlike a bumper sticker or slogan that would annoy me and then go away, I had to sit there and listen to him go on about it for about ten minutes. Even as a sympathetic outsider who was gearing up to write about all the ways that they were misunderstood, I felt betrayed; imagine how that would feel for a committed Christian trying to carve out an identity for themselves that includes both their religion and their sexual orientation.

Much like the staff of InterVarsity did in their "clarification" on matters of sexuality outlined in chapter 5, the speaker here tried to soften his message by assuring us that same-sex desire was no worse than any other problem a believer could grapple with, and that God still loved them. He also explained that staffers would be on hand to talk after the meeting if anyone was confused or upset – another example of a campus ministry attempting to guide members in

interpreting and channeling their emotions as outlined in chapter 4, and here serving to potentially alienate LGBT members from their own desires, emotions, and identities. I realized that it would probably be a good idea to find out what they were saying to questioners, but I was too frustrated to stay, and I may not have been alone in that.

Detailing a tool to use carefully. By definition, facilitators are taking up more of their members' time and attention by calling for participation in a discussion or laying out elaborate and nuanced cases. If it fails to resonate with a potential adherent, the SMO will potentially be subjecting them to the dissonance for much, much longer. This is why it is more often aimed at invested members than potential adherents, though, as in the case of both ministries' websites, the detailing can always be set out for anyone who's interested to peruse at their own pace.

Detailing Meets Smoothing

Frame smoothing tactics, introduced in the previous chapter, and frame detailing have much in common. Both are more commonly directed towards existing members, rather than as a means to attract new recruits, and both require a degree of investment and focus for members and potential members to absorb. While they operate in different circumstances, smoothing specifically being deployed in times of change while detailing can occur any time the SMO has members' ears, they can complement one another and even overlap in some cases.

The clearest case of the two processes working together in this study would be the summer meetings in GCF aimed at reorganizing the ministry and its events to better serve the members. In chapter 5, I identified this as an example of participatory frame smoothing, where we were given the opportunity to take a hand in shaping the organization's new prognostic frame to ensure that we would maintain our investment in GCF and continue to participate in its new form. These

meetings also required a course of frame detailing, however, as we were first thoroughly versed in the specific goals and means that GCF was expected to have (procedural), and then called upon to explore the question of what kinds of activities and events could help the ministry to meet those goals (exploratory.) Participatory frame smoothing will frequently overlap with exploratory detailing because of discussions they see members undertaking; the distinction is merely in which function of the discussion the analyst is concerned with. Is the analysis treating the discussion a means to maintain members' investment? It can then be treated as a smoothing tactic. Is the analysis instead concerned with the instruction in what they should do as members, now and in the future? In that case, treating it as detailing is more helpful.

Similarly, smoothing can be accompanied by detailing when members need instruction in what aspects of the organization's framing have changed or not. For instance, I treated InterVarsity's unofficial purge of LGBT-supporting leaders and employees as being an example of the frame smoothing tactic *emphasizing continuity*, because their main explanation for the move was a reaffirmation of a stance they had always held. The primary detailing that accompanied this move was apologetic (both in the sense of the type, and in the tone of the leader who conveyed it to us), seeking to justify a stance and framing that might leave many members feeling hurt and betrayed. The apologetics behind this decision were quite extensive, and included a release of "A Theological Summary of Human Sexuality," the report that led InterVarsity's leadership to the conclusion that this was the best course to take. (InterVarsity 2016.) The response also recommended a procedure for members to follow, but it was a simple one: search your conscience and decide if you agree with the ministry on these issues. If not, goodbye.

These cases give us two different ways to distinguish between detailing and smoothing, then: function, and intended audience. The function of detailing is primarily instruction, while the

function of smoothing is primarily justification of an ongoing change. Detailing is primarily aimed at members who want to know more about the movement, while smoothing is primarily aimed at members who may be wavering as a result of a recent change. The main point of difference is that smoothing requires a change to be in response to, but once that condition is met, then the two practices can easily meet and complement one another.

Just like other frame alignment processes, a social movement organization has to be able to deploy smoothing and detailing in a way that feels natural and straightforward to members. While it is analytically useful to identify the boundaries between them to pick out different tactics and content, in practice social movement actors will rapidly shift between various frame alignment processes and allow them to blend and decant as needs dictate. The next section will outline an existing concept that frequently blends with and complements frame detailing – frame amplification, employing several different perspectives on the process that past social movement research has taken.

The Bullhorn – Frame Amplification

While frame amplification's definition gives it a broad function, its applications tend to be narrower and more distinct. The archetypical example of frame amplification is the "bumper sticker" sentiment, a bite-sized, easily comprehensible summation of a social movement's framing; for example, "I'm Pro-Life and I Vote." It is a way to efficiently and impactfully convey what a movement is about, give members a cry to rally around, and stick in the memory of potential adherents to be called up later in reference to the movement. While creates a coherent, believable picture of the world that shows potential adherents a place for themselves solving some problem

that it defines, amplification determines what, within that frame, gets highlighted and emphasized, and what is allowed to fade into the background. (Noakes & Johnston 2005)

Frame amplification has not gotten as much attention as the other frame alignment processes; in his "insider's critique," Benford (1997) noted that not many researchers were using it, and in Snow's (2014) review 17 years later, he only mentioned amplification in a list with the other frame alignment processes and then left it alone. However, there have been a variety of approaches to investigating amplification empirically, illustrating different aspects of the concept. Three approaches will inform the organization of this section. First, some applications of frame amplification focus on the elevating of one aspect of an SMO's framing over another, as in McCammon's investigation of strategic essentialism in the suffragist movement (McCammon 2010). Second, others are more straightforward, and look for cases where particular symbols or aspects of the organizations' framing are deliberately foregrounded and reinforced in advertisements or rhetoric (Suh and Park 2014, Tomlins and Bullivant 2016). Third, a few applications pay special attention to the emotions evoked, recognizing that frame amplification can do more than convey information (Hon 2015, Coley 2015).

This section will show some of the different ways that Cru and InterVarsity amplify their framing following these examples – first through strategic amplification, then through organization and emphasis, and then through emotion.

Strategic Amplification

The clearest case of strategic frame amplification would be the relative emphasis of a framing that emphasizes God's mercy and willingness to save us from our own sin over a frame of God's justice coming down on the deserving (which, at its most extreme, includes Hell.) The

"Gospel" they are centered around sharing is the fact that Jesus has saved us from our sins. This emphasis is not just a matter of marketing, however – the hellfire and brimstone approach is "a warped and twisted gospel," according to Ray, and gives Christians nothing to offer the world but fear. The emphasis on mercy is not just to be more appealing, but also to encourage an attitude among members that echoes that mercy. Similarly, the End of Days, while it is an important part of Evangelical framing, is so often used as a way to wiggle out of doing good in the present day that it gets almost no play among campus ministries.

As related in chapter 4, the ministries only rarely approach highly controversial topics, and almost never touch on politics, deemphasizing these topics as a way of avoiding putting up walls for potential adherents. By now, ministry members obliquely dancing around stating their stance on LGBT identities has become a theme of these chapters, and while Cru is more willing to be dismissive of other religions, they will both openly show appreciation for religious pluralism. However, on the rare occasion that the Cru does weigh in on such issues, its speakers do not pull their punches, and will call upon members to recognize the reality of Hell, or not to fall for moral teachers who would have us accept same-sex attraction. InterVarsity strikes a more conciliatory tone, and some of the outside speakers make statements that suggest that their stances on these issues vary. In any case, the ministries' usual de-emphasis of these issues can make it a surprise when they do come up; my experience with the sermon on same-sex attraction above suggests that whether the surprise makes approaching such topics more or less effective comes down to the individual reader or listener, but that it is likely to be more decisive either way. (Were I not studying Cru, that would have been it for my involvement.)

Despite the lack of attention that abortion gets in meetings, interviews reveal that members of both ministries have consistent views: the men, usually taking a moment to remind me to take

their opinion with a grain of salt, are negative-to-ambivalent on abortion, while the women are firmly against it. This trend may seem surprising, but for a pro-choice woman, the ministry's stance against abortion would likely be more of a deal-breaker than it would be for someone who could never get an abortion in the first place. Nevertheless, abortion never came up in any large or small group that I attended, and InterVarsity has recently come under fire from other evangelicals for not coming down on abortion hard enough, particularly in relation to social justice issues, as a speaker at the 2016 Urbana[14] conference railed against the hypocrisy of calling one's self pro-life while not caring about living women and people of color. (Dreher 2016) Opposition to abortion is clearly a part of InterVarsity's framing, but owing to limited resources and the fact that there are other ministries that deal with it, they have not made that issue a centerpiece.

Overall, the ministries are deliberately setting themselves at odds some aspects of American culture – decrying its perceived emphasis on sex, materialism, consumption, and a sense of religious nihilism – and must carefully choose when and how to show their opposition in order to maintain their resonance with members. InterVarsity, especially, is finding this to be a risky balance to strike as both secular and religious forces grind in on it from either side. Apart from an offhand reference to how "unfortunate" one particular instance of conflict with a college over antidiscrimination policies was, however, this aspect of InterVarsity's national experience never touched the meetings I attended.

[14] InterVarsity's nationwide conference used to be held regularly at this campus! I would have expected this fact to get more play, but nobody mentioned it in meetings. This lack of attention for the local chapter's storied history holds true for Cru, as well.

Emphasis and Organization

This form of frame amplification is Cru's hallmark. The three Es that were presented at the start of every meeting, *Embracing the Gospel, Experiencing it Together,* and *Extending it to Others*, were such an efficient distillation of their frame that I was able to organize a large part of chapter 4 around them. Cru has a collection of other catchy slogans, including "Let's journey together" to evoke the adventure of mission trips and finding one's purpose, "It's About Time" to convey a sense of excitement for the 2016 Winter Conference and get students thinking about how they're spending their lives, and one that convinced Ray, a student who became a staffer during the study, to change ministries from a small one called Axiom. "I felt the need to be more evangelistic in my faith, and Axiom, they're open to it, but they don't have the resources to do it in the same way Cru does," he explained. "Cru promotes the heck out of that. One of their slogans is 'reaching the campus to reach the world.' When I found out about that, I was like, 'wow, they'll take students out on summer missions across the ocean, or they offer' – what I'm doing now. I'll be an intern next year!"

Cru's speakers are nearly always local staffers, interns, and students, and while their personal styles and presentation vary, the organization of the sermons follow a consistent formula. Sermons are accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation that sometimes features diagrams or illustrations, but most often offered up the text of the bible verses under discussion or bullet points summarizing the points the speaker was forging through, and ended each sermon with a series of "main points" for us to walk away with. For instance, in the *Seven Letters to Seven Churches*[15] sermon series, where every letter at the start of the book of *Revelation* is broken down into a set of components: Christ, Commendation, Rebuke, Corrections/Consequences, and a Call to

[15] This seems to be drawn from an existing workbook from Rightnow Media. (Fletcher 2016) Many of the sermons I attended drew on existing materials.

Overcome. This framework amplified the most salient points of each, but also allowed individual sermons to spin off into a variety of topics, such is idolatry, how to deal with hard times, what kind of moral teaching we should seek, and more. This breakdown, and the explanation of the letters' cultural context also served the function of making the Bible feel more comprehensible, despite its language and the gulf between its world and ours.

This pattern is echoed by the articles Cru offers online, as they often present their solution or thesis in the form of a numbered or bulleted list, often repeated in sidebars for people taking the article in at a glance. Sometimes there are steps in a process, such as the steps in "A Practical Guide to Hearing from God" (DeCola 2017), consisting of 1) stop, 2) focus, 3) silence, 4) pray. Other times, they are a set of interrelated propositions or bits of advice for different situations, as in "Getting it Together" (Stewart 2017), which has a long list of points including "Reevaluate activities before adding new ones" and "When interruptions come, ask God to multiply your time." While Cru's recommendations frequently take the form of spiritual or internal practices, but they still want to make these practices easily comprehensible and firmly defined. Unlike eternal salvation, these steps are also easily tested. (These sorts of articles will be revisited in the section on "procedural frame detailing" below, but take this as an example of how detailing and amplification can complement one another – the detailing was in writing out the articles, the amplification was in summarizing them so.)

InterVarsity's presentation is generally less concise and orderly. On one of the banners flanking their stage is the banner: "Establish & Advance at Colleges & Universities / Witnessing Communities of Students & Faculty who follow Jesus as Savior & Lord / Growing in Love for God, God's Word, God's People of Every Ethnicity & Culture & God's Purposes in the World." When I remarked to Alex, the local director of InterVarsity, that this was more of a novel than a

slogan, he smiled and said, “The stereotypes {about InterVarsity members} are true. It’s hard to narrow down what’s important when it’s all important, so we say everything.” This is not to say that InterVarsity is unclear or confusing in its presentation, just that it avails itself of these specific tools less often. The articles InterVarsity has on offer are generally longer and denser, and frequently lack concise breakdowns.

Many of the speakers for InterVarsity come in from the outside, rather than being local staff members, and bring with them a variety of different styles. Sometimes congregants will be invited to call out or pose questions. Even knowing the sermon series and topic ahead of time, members never know what, exactly, they will encounter, unless they happen to be familiar with the speaker. This is not to say that they did not engage in frame amplification – each sermon was clearly organized with its most salient points highlighted – but the means by which the amplification was carried out was less consistent between them. The greater challenge and variance is a deliberate feature of the sermons. Director Alex explained that, in his estimation, people love binaries and simple classification systems, but with spiritual matters, those can hinder understanding. Running up against difficult ideas and having to grapple with them is part of the experience that InterVarsity is trying to create.

Neither of these patterns are absolute. Sometimes InterVarsity articles will feature efficient breakdowns, and sometimes Cru articles will meander and sprawl, likewise with the speakers at their meetings. Nevertheless, the general pattern of executive summary vs exegesis holds true from the website to the large group meetings, and even seeps into the small groups. In terms of the self-presentation and the ministries’ conceptions of one another, Cru is a campus ministry by way of the business major, while InterVarsity is a campus ministry by way of sociology.

Emotion

As we were sitting down to start our interview, Director Dale of Cru remarked to me that emotion was a great way to reach the unconverted, where reason will often fail. I gave him a surprised look and he clarified – emotion does not take the *place* of reason, and they are not convincing converts to give up thought. Rather, Christianity's way of approaching life is so counterintuitive that newcomers might need a shock or a tug from beyond reason to consider the world from a different angle.

The altar call is a classic example of reinvigorating the evangelical frame, and InterVarsity's was a master class. Cru's altar calls are less frequent, and less artfully executed, but they follow a similar pattern. With the proper encouragement and the right atmosphere, attendees can be coaxed into dedicating themselves to Jesus, and it will have been their own decision. According to the evangelical frame, everyone yearns to connect with the divine, whether they know it or not, and this is a way to remind them, and encourage them to do something about it.

Even outside of the context of an altar call, music was a great way to set the tone for the evening. Every session at both ministries begins and ends with live music played by a "worship team" up front, for the membership to sing along with. The songs are drawn from a broad pool of contemporary Christian music, and tends towards numbers that try to evoke awe, joy, and sometimes melancholy. A number I found especially striking on this front was Hillsong United's *Oceans* (Hillsong 2013), which was used in both ministries. The use of contemporary music surprised me, but the use of it quickly became apparent: we were not issued hymnals, so getting a whole group to sing along is easier when the music is familiar to many of them, and follows pop conventions so that even congregants who don't know the specific song have a sense of where it is going to go.

The *Seven Letters* were the strictest of the themes I observed, with others allowing speakers much more latitude, such as InterVarsity's "What does the Bible say about ____?" series, each tackling a different thorny issue like racial injustice or mental illness, or Cru's series on sins that can take you out of "the race," where staffers reveal sins that they personally struggle with and offer advice on how to overcome them. Even when they draw from ancient letters to ancient churches, however, the sermons are nearly always rooted in the personal experiences of the speakers, taking us along on their spiritual journey and drawing a line from the esoteric stories of the bible to the here and now. While the ministries are foregrounded as organizations during announcements and in planning mission trips, they all but disappear from sermons; there, the focus is on listeners and their relationships with each other and with God.[16] The show of weakness acts to activate empathy in the listeners and also reassure them in their own struggles.

Similarly, interactions in the small groups are designed to be welcoming and affirming. When I asked her if GCF supplied a safe and open environment, Beth put it best: "I think we're a pretty open-minded group. I think, even the university as a whole is, you know, diverse, and I think if they'll welcome anyone with open arms, and we already have people from different places; Soo Min's from Korea, and she's part of our group…we're just very open-armed. You know?" Encouragement is frequent, and rebukes, when they come, are mild. The attitude that they want to encourage is forgiving, patient, and kind, but also willing to speak up and exhort other members to better things. This is also a site of emphasis for awe, gratitude, and thinking of Bible characters in human terms – occasionally we were encouraged to stop and ponder the meaning of a particular

[16] This focus turns the constant churn of staff and membership into a strength, particularly in Cru, which depends on staff members for sermons more often – a constant stream of staff means new stories and experiences to link, and a constant stream of members means new audiences for the stories of those who stick around. It is a very different dynamic than in a community church.

verse. What would it be like to be Ruth in this situation? Can you believe the God of *everything* cares this much for you?

As noted in chapter 4, both campus ministries sought to encourage positive emotions in attendees because of the actions that such emotions encourage. While members are urged to take their faith seriously and have respect for the spiritual jeopardy the people they witness to are under, neither ministry wants to raise a body of believers who are fearful, angry, or contemptuous of nonbelievers. However, emotions and recruitment are not the only ways that framing can bear on the actions of existing members; the next section will be detailing a new discursive practice whereby SMO actors seek to instruct and encourage other members in the right ways of being and doing as members.

Conclusion

There are two links between frame detailing and frame amplification that make it important to consider them together. The first is that, while they operate in different ways, there is significant conceptual overlap in terms of their function. Both amplification and detailing "clarify and invigorate" an organization's framing, but amplification operates by condensing, simplifying, and emphasizing, while detailing works by expanding, explaining, and adding nuance. They are opposed but complementary practices – careful amplification will enable a reader or listener to more fully understand an SMO's detailing, and, when potential adherents are intrigued or alarmed by its amplification, a course of frame detailing can assure them that there is something to the slogans, and help them to understand what they should do now that they are mobilized.

The second connection lies in the fact that frame-alignment theory carries a consistent danger of treating social movement members as "Spock-like beings" driven by cold rationality

(Benford 1997), an old criticism that continues to stand because it represents a pitfall that theorists can still fall into, rather than a methodological technique that just had to be fixed. Frame detailing risks running headlong into this problem by emphasizing the ways in which framing is rationally laid out and explained, and adherents are convinced to intellectually assent to it; presenting it alongside the emotional appeal of the ministries helps this analysis to avoid losing sight of other ways that members and movement organizations can connect.

While frame detailing is important to the activities of campus ministries, it is not their primary goal or means of reaching members. As the UIUC chapter of Cru's website says, "this site, like knowing Jesus, is about relationships, not just knowledge." (UICru 2018) In interviews, when Shae admitted to me that she might not be getting all that much from the sermons in the large group meetings, as they were so basic, she still saw the meetings as a chance to serve others. When Graham, Drake, and Kyle expressed disillusionment in GCF, it was not in the quality of the instruction we received, but rather in the lack of a broader sense of community. "Is mere knowledge enough?" is a question that has come up in multiple bible study sessions, and the answer has always been, "No." As detailed in chapter 4, the sense of fellowship and mutual support the ministries build is at least as important, and the member's personal connection with Jesus, lying far beyond mere persuasion, takes precedence over all.

This introduction for frame detailing is necessarily constricted, being based on an in-depth study of one particular type of social movement organization. Future work using it will not only reveal more about the social movement organizations chosen, but also to refine detailing as a concept and ensure that it is useful for the broad applications that it was made for.

Chapter 7 - Raiding the Bastions of a Broken World: Future Research in Both Frame Smoothing and Frame Detailing

I set out on this study of Cru and InterVarsity Christian Fellowship with two main goals. The first was to study a little-explored but highly influential area of campus life, while additionally demonstrating that campus ministries could be analyzed as social movement organizations. Second, in the spirit of an extended case method study, I sought to create useful additions to frame alignment theory through my fieldwork; the broader applicability of this study was thus not in assuming that the slices of Cru and InterVarsity that I encountered represent campus ministries across the nation, but rather in the possibility of applying the new analytic concepts of frame smoothing tactics and frame detailing to other movements and settings, as well as in exploring the possibility of breaking the assumed temporal relationship of diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing.

These new concepts were outlined and explored in chapters that applied Benford and Snow's concepts of frame extension, bridging, transformation, and amplification to the frames of both ministries, which served to contrast them against the existing body of theory and show what they added. However, coining the concepts was only the start. This chapter will briefly cover some of the major themes and tensions that I observed in the organizations' framing throughout the analysis, the limitations of the current study, and possible future avenues of research.

Themes and Contradictions

There are two major themes in the framing of both Cru and IVCF. The first is the uneasy balance that the ministries must reach between resonating with the broader culture of their campus and nation, and being at odds with it. They are highly conscious of this tension, and indeed see

the individual experience of it as part of being a Christian. Multiple interviewees, including Ray, Brett, Ken, and Mae, when addressing the question of whether their Christianity affected their social prospects, admitted that they felt their faith should be impacting their social prospects *more*. Many social movements face a similar tension, of course, as they are all trying to change aspects of society, but this is a different prospect for Christian movements because they do not believe that victory can possibly come of their efforts. Where most SMOs have conditions that they could meet to declare victory, the campus ministries do not see a future where they can ever demobilize – at least until Jesus returns and ends history. As long as life as we know it continues, they will have to stay on the knife's edge of being *in* their culture without being *of* it.

One of the harshest manifestations of this tension is in their treatment of LGBT people, members and outsiders alike. They believe that same-sex attraction is sinful, but that people who experience it are not, themselves, uniquely sinful. This is just one manifestation of the "brokenness of the world," so while members should not condone such attraction, they also should not be cruel to people who experience it. In this way, they hope to stand for what they believe are Biblical principles regarding sexuality without joining in on the historic persecution of LGBT people. As noted previously, this produces a prognostic frame that seeks to alienate LGBT members from their own sexuality and/or gender identity, turning it from a part of them into an invading sin that they must grapple with. The approach of the two ministries is surprisingly similar, though the IVCF members I have interviewed are generally less pleased with this stance, and do not have as firm of a consensus on it.

Members are under no illusion that they are persecuted in the US, but at the same time hold themselves separate from the broader culture, and feel that it does not represent them. Even in cases where they face formal opposition, such as when IVCF's chapters were "de-recognized" as

RSOs on various campuses, they try to avoid feeding into the Christian Right narrative of persecution. The harshest response I have encountered from an InterVarsity source on this front is that its chapters may have to learn to operate in a "culture of increasing opposition," but then their solutions were just ways to fundraise and organize events without campus support. (The local chapter has not faced a situation like this yet.) This attitude is most likely due to the missional focus of both ministries, and their awareness of places where Christians are less well-off.

This tension also shapes the ministries' approach to politics. They hold political participation as important, and that members' faith should guide their political decisions, but do not direct members in who to vote for and how. This allows them to cast a net broad enough to include Democrats, Republicans, and others, while still asserting that faith should profoundly shape members' lives. The Bible is big and complex enough for both sides of the US's political divide to call upon for guidance, and the ministries hold that they would be diminishing it to bind it to any particular political faction. While Cru is closely tied with more overtly political right-wing Christian organizations, these connections are not addressed in ministry meetings.

This points to the second major theme: adaptability. Despite the fact that the basis of their claims is a supernatural authority emanating from beyond time itself, both ministries have been highly successful in changing with the times to retain their relevancy. Smoothing tactics help with this process, helping members to sort through rules, principles, and beliefs to find the ones that ought to be held as eternal. Whenever there is a major change in their framing, both ministries have an explanation ready, and that explanation will be posed in the terms of the Bible, which they hold to be the eternal Word of God.

Even detailing, which would seem to make the framing of an organization unwieldy and highly specific, can instead add to its ability to speak to new circumstances and challenges. How

should we respond to this new social problem? What does our faith say we should do in these turbulent times? These are questions with answers, and the ministries are eager to supply them. Just as Christianity has built up a vast canon of traditions and laws, detailing allows campus ministries to build up a backlog of explanations, procedures, and justifications that can be redeployed for new challenges.

Whether they were deliberately designed so or not, Cru and IVCF are well-suited to the strange position they have carved out in public life. They offer enough to potentially challenge members in every area of their lives, while also avoiding or deemphasizing issues and positions that are likely to be deal-breakers. It would be hard to argue that they are a counter-culture, but what they offer feels meaningfully different from mainstream US culture to members, and it is plausible to them that it could be a vehicle to change the world. Also, as even they would point out, in a society where 70.7% of the people identify as Christian, their tension with the broader culture is unlikely to snap and become their undoing.

Broadly, the framing of the ministries runs counter to the findings of both Bielo (2009) and Smith (1998). The bible studies I attended did focus on building a warm, supportive environment as Bielo observed, but none of the members I interviewed had much of a sense that the rest of the world was particularly hostile to their faith. (On the other hand, his point about evangelicals watching every moment for a chance to act out their faith dovetails with the intense program of frame extension that I observed.) Smith saw evangelicals as thriving in a state of intense spiritual competition, which was borne out by the willingness of early Cru to "storm" Berkley in the 60s and 70s, taking advantage of the rising counterculture to put forward its alternative. However, in the present day, their stances towards their fellow evangelical Christians on campus, and towards the secular academy as a whole, suggest that that they can also benefit from pointedly avoiding

direct competition. Both of these threads may lead to particular adaptations that the campus ministries have taken to the college environment, and I am eager to pull on them.

Limitations

Fieldwork was carried out over a single year, which was time enough to gather a detailed snapshot of the campus ministries' current, but not ideal for capturing changes in their operations or framing over time. In particular, when considering frame smoothing tactics, it became necessary to extend the analysis far beyond the period of the study in order to capture some of the shifts I wanted to include. As the ministries are constantly reorganizing, refining, and responding to new members and staff, it was fortunately possible to take part in smaller-scale changes happening concurrently with fieldwork, but this constant change also makes the short period of fieldwork a significant limitation.

The nature of my participation in both ministries meant that, apart from personal information revealed in interviews, I was not privy to any information that was not available to the public. If the ministries have secret internal workings, I was not in a position to see them.

My status as a man who was significantly older than the average campus ministry member limited the picture of the ministries that I could get. Not only did this restrict the spaces that I had access to, but it also mediated the way members addressed me and what they would feel comfortable talking about with/in front of me. I was able to get a narrow window into the other bible studies in conversation with members, and through interviews, but that is not the same thing as experiencing it. This is especially relevant to ministries that serve different populations; for instance, the Covenant Fellowship Church ministry that serves primarily Korean students likely strikes a very different balance in its approach to other cultures and how its members are expected

to comport themselves on campus than either Cru or InterVarsity. Additionally, more interview data would strengthen this study or its successors, and it would be more easily gathered by a wider variety of researchers.

Additionally, multiple interviewees suggested that other campus ministries and related organizations, or even other chapters of their own ministries, have substantially different cultures and expectations than the ones we had met in on this campus. Future research into campus ministries in other settings may find

With these weaknesses in mind, the next section will explore a variety of avenues for future research that this study suggests.

Future Research

Some expansions to this study that don't need to wait for further fieldwork. This dissertation has been fairly narrowly focused on the frame alignment literature, with some dashes of related theories like Gamson's collective action frames (1995) and emotion (Jasper 2011). The data gathered can be brought to bear on other literatures, as well, and drawing connections to a broader range of perspectives on social movements will help to deepen our understanding of framing itself, and avoid the trap of having framing do work that would be better served by other analytic concepts, such as ideology (Oliver & Johnston 2000) or collective identity formation (Flesher-Fominaya 2010, Bean 2014).

Investigating Frame Smoothing Tactics

As noted above, the current study's brief timeframe meant that it was not the ideal format for studying frame smoothing tactics. Most of the changes that I observed had either taken place

long ago, or were presently being called for with little sign of whether they would be undertaken or not, or what form they would take. It seems likely that a longitudinal or detailed historical study would give better results in pinning down the qualities of smoothing tactics and how members receive them.

The current design of frame smoothing as a concept fits social movement organizations like campus ministries, which have large memberships, but relatively small circles of leaders who make decisions that affect the participation of the rest. This arrangement enabled me to pinpoint distinct announcements, decisive shifts, and singular calls for change, and the tactics that the people making the decision or demand were calling for. In a more egalitarian social movement, smoothing could potentially take on different forms; rather than the organization undertaking to justify changes that it had already made, it would be members trying to convince their fellows to make changes.

What other sorts of social movement organizations would be good sites to investigate smoothing tactics? Any social movement can use them, but the trans rights movement, or LGBT rights movements more generally, may be a particularly striking example, as activism and language evolves along with our scientific and cultural understanding of trans identities. While the challenge in this study was to capture long-term changes with a short exposure, the challenge there might lie in keeping up. Other religious movements, which also call upon invariant truths and yet must account for changing framing, would also be good sites. Finally, we could consider political movements responding to the changing winds in Washington – for instance, right-wing organizations grappling with the rise of Trump and the effect he has on the electorate.

Other work that covers shifts in SMO framing paints a more dynamic picture, with the organization's framing being continually modified and contested over the organization's life

(Rothman & Oliver 1999). Integrating smoothing practices into this literature may require re-conceptualizing it as a set of purely rhetorical tactics that are undertaken when a shift in framing is called for, whether or not the shift actually happens. This would be consistent with the example of Michelle Hayden's call for a more multi-ethnic ministry is still open, and it remains to be seen who will respond, and how.

Another direction to expand the concept of smoothing in is towards collective identity. The explicit framing of an SMO is far from the only consideration that it faces when determining whether members will accept a change in its framing; appeals to different assumed aspects of the shared identities of members can also serve to smooth changes or point out deficiencies in the current/old framing. The work that they have done in building a collective identity can also create obstacles for changes in framing – such as in the example of the hurt and betrayal of queer IVCF members who felt safe there because it was the ministry most overtly concerned with looking after the downtrodden and oppressed, only to discover that it had no place for them as well.

Expanding on Frame Detailing

A challenge inherent to designing projects around frame detailing difficult is that the very concept involves drawing out, expanding, and elaborating ideas, but writing about multiple instances of detailing requires the researcher to then recompress those ideas and describe the expansions they observed in a few strokes. This is less a problem with the theory than it is a challenge in expressing it – one that I ran up against in writing chapter 6. It also helped to have earlier chapters to set up the organization's overall framing in advance, but a researcher trying to write smaller projects about frame detailing will not have as much room to do so.

The close binding of apologetic and procedural frame detailing in the ministries' framing may be, in part, because of how closely their mission is bound to convincing outsiders of their framing of the world. Whether this is a feature of campus ministry framing or a flaw in the typology will be revealed in future research on different types of movement organizations, as suggested in chapter 6.

One candidate for an additional function (or type, if the new typology isn't needed) is *dramatizing frame detailing*. Coley's (2015) exploration of labor novels would provide an example; he puts the novels forward as prime examples of frame amplification and frame transformation (in the Snowian sense of transforming the frame of individual readers), which is perfectly fitting. However, the act of spinning a frame out into a full narrative for a prospective adherent to read along with could also be a perfect example of detailing, even though it is not a procedural description or overt justification. This is more than just a barrage of evocative images, after all; the reader is being drawn into a narrative that they can see their place in. For a less profound example of dramatizing frame detailing, we could look at marketing copy – for instance, the INDYCC (Cru winter conference) website tells readers a story about what INDYCC could mean for their lives, and leaves them to resolve the cliffhanger.

Finally, frame detailing may serve as a window for framing research into ideology, or vice-versa. Oliver and Johnston (2000) warned of the danger of allowing framing to absorb the functions of other concepts, particularly ideology; they contended that ideology is a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of the world on the part of individuals and organizations, and that it has an existence beyond their mere framing practices. In their view, framing can get someone started on a new path, but it does not necessarily cause them to uproot their whole understanding of the world. Frame detailing has potential as a bridge here because it allows us to

examine the ways that deeper instruction in an organization's worldview takes place; it does not take the place of ideology, but rather acknowledges that even when you are speaking in-depth about an organizational or personal worldview, you are still choosing what to focus on and emphasize. To stretch the "framing" analogy a little further, frame detailing may be a slow camera pan over a landscape of ideology.

Frame detailing is a discursive practice that *any* social movement can engage in and benefit from, as the conflicts and strategies they engage in are complex. However, there are some sites where detailing could be particularly striking to see in action or illuminating to study. While the possibilities seem limitless, these are two areas of particular interest.

An analysis of labor unions using frame detailing would venture into a different side of them than their activities reveal to the broader public. When the GEO went on strike, most students only saw us marching in circles and chanting slogans, or perhaps perused handouts that offered a bite-sized summation of the current labor conflict. The detailed explanations of labor laws as they related to our case, the set of steps that we should take if we thought that we were being retaliated against, the intricacies of UIUC's finances (to the extent that they were visible to us), and many other topics were communicated to us as members, but not bellowed through the bullhorns as we picketed. Researchers have employed frame alignment theory to capture such aspects of union organizing as shifting tactics to include and empower young mothers (Yates 2010), fostering class-based solidarity along gender lines (Tsarouhas 2011), and building coalitions with movements that have different priorities, such as the environmental movement (Mayer et al. 2010), and more. The detailing framework could reveal more about how members are instructed in their roles and contribute to the union's tactics in turn.

Also, whether or not they are engaged with academia, feminist and antiracist movements are grappling with fantastically complex problems that manifest structurally and interpersonally, and have to prepare members for wide ranges of situations and issues that they could encounter in their day to day lives. How do you recognize your prejudices infecting your thinking? How do you avoid microaggressing, or handling microaggressions against yourself? How do you accept correction? What do you do when you see someone yanking a woman's hijab off? Frame detailing can help us to collect and describe their repertoire of actions and arguments.

Are there any social movement organizations that could be said to *not* engage in frame detailing? Perhaps not, but there is one type of movement where it is likely to take a very different form than it does here. Social media has been transforming the ways that some social movement organizations relate to their members and mobilize over great distances. (Bekkers et al. 2011) While the ministries here did not avail themselves very much of social media beyond coordinating and advertising activities, meetings, and events in real space, an SMO that relies more heavily on the internet might engage in a different kind of detailing.

A loosely organized, largely-anonymous swarm like Gamergate did indeed have an associated body of literature, a loose and shifting leadership, and an easily-grasped frame. They met in forums, and there are public speakers with GG sympathies. But there were no formal meetings or courses of instruction in the ways of Gamergate, and individuals who take actions on its behalf may not engage very deeply with its ideology or understanding of the world beyond the most basic form of its injustice frame – indeed, its prognostic frame recommends swift action by any sympathetic gamers, whatever their other attachments or priorities. Moreover, the activities that were asked of them, including arguing, harassing, and sometimes producing art, are not things that the organization needs to tell them how to do. This suggests that, while even a scattered SMO

like Gamergate engages in frame detailing, this may not be the most illuminating way to analyze it. (Mortensen 2016)

There are three aspects of frame detailing that will be important to watch out for when it comes time to apply frame detailing to other types of social movement organizations. The first is that the three types suggested in this chapter, procedure, apologetics, and exploration, are not necessarily co-equal, and may take on different levels of emphasis in different organizations. For instance, apologetic frame detailing is particularly important in campus ministries because one of the central pillars of their prognostic frame involves presenting their frame to outsiders and defending it before them. In another social movement, for example, the vegan movement, apologetics might take a backseat to procedural frame detailing, as new members will need to know how to find other sources of protein and cook enjoyable meals without the animal products that they are avoiding. In addition to different relevant weights, they might be articulated differently with one another; procedural and apologetic frame detailing will likely come together less frequently in many other movements, for instance.

The second is the prioritization of which topics get extensively detailed, and which are merely mentioned or even ignored. This will likely reflect the overall priorities of the SMO, but it can also reveal propositions that are held as important but seen as so self-evident that they don't need explaining ("Workers at this factory should be paid enough to avoid starving to death"), or possibly implications or aspects of their framing they hope "fly under the radar" and get less attention. ("The jingoism we espouse will likely lead to your sons and daughters being sent off to war if we attain power.") Types of elision in detailing may become another aspect of the theory, but this analysis did not reveal very many frequently elided topics apart from electoral politics and LGBT rights, and they get more attention in the online articles.

Finally, as noted above, the details that are revealed by this practice may not always be consistent between different organizations within a movement, chapters within organizations, or even members within chapters. Because exploration can be carried out on an individual level by people with different personal frames, apologetics can be crafted for different local opponents, and procedures are made for different needs and circumstances, the detailing encountered in any one location should not be taken to stand for others, and it should not be assumed that social movement actors writing or speaking on behalf of national movements are producing work that will be accepted in every detail by those local groups.

A Possible Future for Detailing and Smoothing

Just over 20 years ago, Robert D. Benford (1997) called for more empirical, comparative work that deals with framing processes across social movements, and his call remains relevant even today (Snow 2014). As an in-depth study of a pair of closely-related social movement organizations at one school, this project was never going to fill that lacuna. However, moving forward, it presents the opportunity to build studies that will. As I (and possibly others) batter these concepts against different social movements, a body of literature will take form that will allow for comparison across different movements and organizations. For instance, the use and choice of frame smoothing tactics depends a great deal on the relationship of members to the organization's leaders, and what they expect out of their membership. If frame smoothing does indeed take different forms in social movement organizations with different power structures, the concept could be helpful in revealing the different degrees of participation and agency offered to members of different movements.

McAdam (2012) observed that research into social movement framing has been preoccupied with the leadership of social movement organizations, rather than the experiences and actions of individual members. While I have tried to include the perspectives and actions of individuals in this study, I have spent a lot of analysis and words on the official story from the leadership, rather than the motivations of members. For this reason, I believe that the last classification for each concept – *inviting participation* in the case of frame smoothing tactics, and *exploration* in the case of frame detailing – will be the most fruitful. In chapters 5 and 6, they stand out in their typologies as catch-alls for a broad array of discursive practices and organization tactics with the common thread that they all depend on the participation of members (rather than just the direction of leadership.) With more than this brief study as data, a wider variety of means of participation could become visible between different social movements.

As noted in chapter 6, the two practices can come together when the circumstances are right, with the main difference in classification resting on the analyst's interest. One way that the interaction of smoothing and detailing could become illuminating is considering how detailed and extensive the justifications for changes in framing turn out to be in different movements. Are members expected to accept shifts in framing with a quick slogan, or are they instructed in the reasons for the change and the ins and outs of the new framing? And further, what is the reasoning behind this interplay – for instance, does it allow members a chance to object or possibly even avert changes, or is it simply a means to make them feel heard and provide a forum for convincing them more thoroughly? This likely varies not just by organization, but also by issue; for instance, we were given a chance to influence GCF's future course in its summer meetings, but members who were invited up to discuss InterVarsity's stance on same-sex attraction had no hope of reversing the national leadership's position.

Continuing the Study of Campus Ministries

When I continue to research campus ministries, I will need allies representing other ages and demographics in order to follow the example of Snow et al.'s (2017) study on megachurches. The tone, culture, and lessons of individual bible study groups and sub-ministries varied widely even within demographics. Particularly in the case of Cru, where undergrad-level bible study groups were gender-segregated, having eyes on both groups has the potential to reveal more about the ministry's treatment of gender, both in its framing and in its concrete practices.

Another area where this study was tightly focused, and more exploration could pay dividends, is in looking for partner ministries, branches, and associations with other religious organizations. The All Campus Worship revealed dozens of ministries and nonprofits that Cru and IVCF have at least passing contact with, which do not often bear on their day-to-day activities. Most important, however, is the revelation of aspects of the evangelical frame that ministries agree with and would support, but do not give much attention to themselves. For instance, investigating Cru's website, I became concerned that they never seemed to talk about Jews as anything other than historical characters in the story of Jesus. Why not ever acknowledge them as a people living today? Bright's biography (Richardson 2000) asserts that Cru makes no special effort to seek out Jews to convert them, nor will it turn them away. However, in a deep corner of their website, I discovered reference to the ministry *One for Israel*, which operates in the Holy Land and does seek to convert Jews specifically – and claims to have been founded with the encouragement of Campus Crusade for Christ. (Notably, the ministry that operates in the Middle East insisted on referring to it as the Campus *Crusade*, even in 2013.)

This process of expanding into new areas by breaking apart and/or encouraging the rise of new affiliates and allies seems to be a powerful and versatile way of expanding a movement's reach, because the new organizations can ask for support but are not bound to the same bureaucracy. This can also serve to elide or minimize aspects of the movement's framing to allow specific ministries to appeal more broadly; a member who felt my creeping unease at the way that Cru tends to talk about Jews need never be confronted with their aim to convert Jewish people, while a member who expressed an interest in doing so could be directed towards *One for Israel*. This could be another way of finding the balance between opposition and resonance with US culture mentioned above.

Finally, there are types of events that I did not get to go on during my fieldwork that could inform large parts of the workings of campus ministries and the experience of being a member – most notably, mission trips to foreign lands, and the periodic conferences they relentlessly advertised in the leading up weeks. As noted in chapter 5, Jordan received more of his in-depth instruction in Cru's inner workings in a conference – while this study was able to find out some of these deeper aspects through interviews, it would still be good for a researcher to experience this instruction firsthand.

Conclusion

Struggling to find the balance between recognizing the agency of one's subjects and the structures that constrain them has been a theme in the evolution of frame alignment theory since its conception. In this study, I have attempted to craft theoretical tools that can be used to capture the experiences and understandings of individual members of social movement organizations without eliding the forces seeking to constrain and direct them, frame smoothing tactics by

carrying the implicit acknowledgment of members' continuing agency in the need to persuade them to accept changes, and frame detailing in being a practice that any member of a social movement can engage in, though those in a position of authority employ it in different ways. They have served well in this study, but the true test of both lies ahead, in future studies that reapply and refine them.

Bibliography

Ackman, Gabe. 2016. "Top 10 Things to Pack for College." Retrieved April 14, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/communities/campus/blog/2016/top-10-things-to-pack-for-college.html)

Arnold, Naomi. 2018. "Heart of Racism." Retrieved March 10, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/blog/life-and-relationships/hardships/heart-of-racism.html)

Bartley, Tim and Curtis Child. 2014. "Shaming the Corporation: The Social Production of Targets and the Anti-Sweatshop Movement." *American Sociological Review*. 79(4):653-679.

BBC. 2018. "China's pre-Christmas Church crackdown raises alarm." Retrieved March 2, 2019. (https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-46588650)

Bean, Lydia. 2014. *The Politics of Evangelical Identity.* Princeton University Press. Woodstock, OX.

Berger, Peter L. 1929. *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion.* Doubleday. Garden City, NY.

Berkey, Scott and UnChong Berkey. 2018. "Scott and UnChong Berkey." Retrieved: March 12, 2018. (https://give.cru.org/0441233)

Bekkers, V., H. Beunders, A. Edwards, R. Moody. 2011. "New media, micromobilization, and political agenda setting: Crossover effects in political mobilization and media usage." *Information Society*. Volume 27, Issue 4, Pages 209-219

Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization" in *From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research Across Cultures* edited by Tarrow, Sydney G., Bert Klandermans, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Bingley, UK. JAI Press.

Benford, Robert D. 1997. "An Insider's Critique of the Social Movement Framing Perspective." *Sociological Inquiry* 67(4):409-430.

Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26:611-39.

Bernstein, Mary. 1997. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." 103(3):531-565.

Berry, Rasool. 2018. "How MLK Challenges Us All." Retrieved: April 12, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/train-and-grow/spiritual-growth/how-mlk-challenges-us-all.html)

Bielo, James. 2009. *Words Upon the Word: An Ethnography of Evangelical Bible Study.* New York: NYU Press.

Blee, Kathleen M. and Verta Taylor. 2002. "Semi-Structured Interviewing in Social Movement Research." Pp. 92-117 in *Methods of Social Research,* edited by Bert Klandermans and Suzanne Staggenborg. Minneapolis, MN. University of Minnesota Press.

Bright, Bill. 2018. "Today's Promise (3/26)." Retrieved: March 1. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/train-and-grow/spiritual-growth/devotionals/todays-promise/03/26.html)

Broqua, Christophe and Oliver Fillieule. 2018. "The Making of State Homosexuality: How AIDS Funding Shaped Same-Sex Politics in France." *American Behavioral Scientist.* 16(13):1623-1639.

Bullis, Kurt. 2013. "Reflections from a Committed Sleeper." Retrieved: March 3. (https://intervarsity.org/blog/reflections-committed-sleeper)

Burawoy, Michael. 1998. "The extended case method." *Sociological Theory.* 16(1):4-34.

Castuera, Ignacio. 2017. "A Social History of Christian Thought on Abortion: Ambiguity vs. Certainty in Moral Debate." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* 76(1):121-226.

Chiarello, Elizabeth. 2018. "Where Movements Matter: Examining Unintended Consequences of the Pain Management Movement in Medical, Criminal Justice, and Public Health Fields." *Law and Policy.* 40(1):79-109.

Christiansen, Jonathan. 2013. "Four Stages of Social Movements." *Research Starters: Sociology (Online Edition)* Retrieved February 20, 2018. (https://www.ebscohost.com/uploads/imported/thisTopic-dbTopic-1248.pdf)

Connolly, William E. 2005. "The Evangelical-Capitalist Resonance Machine." *Political Theory.* 33(6):869-886.

Coley, Jonathan S. 2015. "Narrative and Frame Alignment in Social Movements: Labor Problem Novels and the 1929 Gastonia Strike." *Social Movement Studies*.14(1):58-74.

Crespo, Orlando. 2015. "A Theology of Reconciliation in the midst of Racial Strife." Retrieved April 13, 2018. (https://mem.intervarsity.org/blog/theology-reconciliation-midst-racial-strife)

Cress, Daniel M. and David A. Snow. 2000. "The Outcomes of Homeless Mobilization: The Influence of Organization, Disruption, Political Mediation, and Framing." *American Journal of Sociology* 105:1063-1104.

Cru A. 2018. "0% Alcohol, 100% Jesus." Retrieved: April 15, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/communities/campus/collegebound/blog/0-alcohol-100-jesus.html)

Cru B. 2018. "3 Modes of Evangelism Discussion." Retrieved: April 18, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/train-and-grow/leadership-training/starting-a-ministry/start/evangelism/3-modes-of-evangelism-discussion.html)

Cru C. 2018. "Adult Discipleship Resources." Retrieved" March 12, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/train-and-grow/help-others-grow/discipleship/adult-discipleship-resources.html)

Cru D. 2018. "How to Lead a Small Group." Retrieved: April 18, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/train-and-grow/help-others-grow/collaborative-discipleship/lessons/4c-how-to-lead-a-small-group.html)

Cru E. 2018. "Healthcare Student Mission / Whole Person Care Preceptorship." Retrieved: March 11, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/opportunities/mission-trips/summer/explore/destinations/807.html)

Cru Comm. 2018. "The Return of Christ." Retrieved March 3, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/train-and-grow/spiritual-growth/devotionals/the-return-of-christ.html)

Cru FAQ. 2018. "Would You Like to Know God Personally?" Retrieved April 14, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/how-to-know-god/would-you-like-to-know-god-personally.html)

Cru Locations. 2019. "Asia – Locations." Accessed March 11, 2019. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/communities/locations/asia.html)

Cru Parents FAQ. 2018. "FAQ's for Parents." Retrieved: April 14, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/communities/campus/collegebound/parents/faq.html)

Dabbs Sciubba, Jennifer. 2014. "Framing and Power in Aging Advocacy." *Social Movement Studies* 13(4):465-481.

Davy, Keith. 2018. “CruPress Presents: Modes of Evangelism.” Retrieved: April 18, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/train-and-grow/share-the-gospel/evangelism-principles/crupress-presents-modes-of-evangelism.html)

DeCola, Nick. 2017. “A Practical Guide to Hearing From God.” Retrieved: April 20, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/train-and-grow/life-and-relationships/work-and-rest/a-practical-guide-to-hearing-from-god.html)

De La Torre, Miguel. 2017. “The Death of Christianity in the U.S.” Retrieved March 23, 2019. (http://drmigueldelatorre.com/2017/the-death-of-christianity-in-the-u-s/)

Dochuk, Darren. 2012. *From Bible Belt to Sun Belt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise Evangelical Conservatism.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Dorrough-Smith, Leslie. 2014. *Righteous Rhetoric: Sex, Speech, and the Politics of Concerned Women for America.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Dowland, Seth. 2015. *Family Values and the Rise of the Christian Right.* University of Pennsylvania Press. Philadelphia, PA.

Dreher, Rod. 2016. “Do #UnbornLivesMatter to InterVarsity?” Retrieved: April 20, 2018. (http://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/black-lives-matter-unborn-intervarsity-abortion/)

Fea, John. 2018. “Progressive Evangelicals Revive the 1973 Chicago Declaration of Evangelical Social Concern.” Retrieved March 10, 2019. (https://thewayofimprovement.com/2018/10/10/progressive-evangelicals-revive-the-1973-chicago-declaration-of-evangelical-social-concern/)

Ferchak, Rachel. 2016. “4 Things You Need to Know About Life After College.” Retrieved: April 14, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/communities/campus/4-things-you-need-to-know-about-life-after-college.html)

Flesher Fominaya, Cristina. 2010. “Collective Identity in Social Movements: Central Concepts and Debates.” *Sociology Compass.* 4(6):393-404.

Fletcher, Michael. 2016. “Seven Letters to Seven Churches.” Retrieved: April 20, 2018. (https://www.rightnowmedia.org/Content/Series/256364?episode=1)

Ford, Zack and Jack Jenkins. 2016. “How a massive campus organization systematically purges staffers who support LGBT people.” Retrieved: March 2, 2019. (https://thinkprogress.org/intervarsity-lgbt-firing-87de4493c2f/)

Fuller, Paula and Jim Lundgren. “I Am Worn Out from My Groaning.” Retrieved March 5, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/news/%E2%80%9Ci-am-worn-out-my-groaning%E2%80%9D)

Gamson, William A. 1995. “Constructing Social Protest.” In Culture and Social Movements. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gasaway, Brantley W. 2014. *Progressive Evangelicals and the Pursuit of Social Justice.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Gilmer, Charles. 2009. *A Cry of Hope, A Call to Action: Unleashing the Next Gneration of Black Christian Leaders.* Lake Mary, FL: Creation House.

Gorski, Philip. 2017. “Why evangelicals voted for trump: A critical cultural sociology.” *American Journal of Sociology.* 5(3):338-354.

Govier, Gordon. 2014. “When InterVarsity was Derecognized at Purdue.” Retrieved: April 14, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/news/when-intervarsity-was-derecognized-purdue)

Guenther, Katja M. and Kerry Mulligan. 2013. “From the Outside In: Crossing Boundaries to Build Collective Identity in the New Atheist Movement.” *Social Problems.* 60(4):457-475.

Guest, Greg, Kathleen MacQueen M., and Emily E. Namey. 2012. *Applied Thematic Analysis.* SAGE Publications. Thousand Oaks, California.

Harrell, Reginal M. 2012. “An Ecologist’s Perspective of Creation Care and Restoration.” Retrieved March 19, 2019. (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260907739_An_Ecologist's_Perspective_of_Creation_Care_and_Restoration)

Hill, Alec. 2010. “Campuses Renewed.” Retrieved: April 14, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/news/campuses-renewed)

Hill, Theron. 2016. “Are Trump’s White Evangelical Supporters Racist?” Retrieved March 20, 2019. (https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2016/december-web-only/are-trumps-white-evangelical-supporters-racist.html)

Hillsong United. 2013. *Oceans (Where Feet May Fail).* Retrieved: April 20, 2018. (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-8mZpGj29qw)

Homan, Casey P., Marcus Mann, and Ryan T. Cragun. 2016. "United States of America: Secularist, Humanist, Atheist, and Freethought Bus Advertisements in the United States; Functions, Responses, and Effectiveness." Pp. 369–94 in *The Atheist Bus Campaign: Global Manifestations and Responses*, edited by S. Tomlins and S. Bullivant. Leiden; Boston: Brill Academic Pub.

Hon, Linda. 2016. "Social media framing within the Million Hoodies movement for justice." *Public Relations Review.* 42(1):9-19.

Hunt, Keith and Gladys Hunt. 1991. *For Christ and the University: The Story of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship of the U.S.A./1940-1990*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press.

Hunt, S., R. Benford and David Snow 1994. 'Identity Fields: Framing Processes and The Social Construction of Movement Identities.' Pp. 185–208 in *New Social Movements: From Ideology To Identity*, edited by E. Laran˜ a, H. Johnston and J. R. Gusfield. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Hutchinson, Mark and John Wolffe. 2012. *A Short History of Global Evangelicalism.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

InterVarsity. 2016. "A Theological Summary of Human Sexuality." Retrieved: March 1, 2019. (https://www.scribd.com/document/326684433/InterVarsity-Christian-Fellowship-Theology-of-Human-Sexuality-Paper#download)

IVCF A. 2003. "War With Iraq." Retrieved: March 10, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/news/war-iraq)

IVCF B. 2006. "World AIDS Day." Retrieved: March 11, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/news/world-aids-day)

IVCF C. 2018. "Conversation Stoppers Series." Retrieved: April 17, 2018. (http://evangelism.intervarsity.org/resource/conversation-stoppers-series)

IVCF D. 2018. "The Large Group Meeting Handbook." Retrieved: April 19, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/handbooks/large-group/largegroupmeetingshandbookindex)

IVCF E, 2014. "The Debate on Campus." Retrieved: April 20, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/news/debate-campus)

IVCF F. 2018. "Four Reasons to Go on a Global Program. Retrieved: April 12, 2018. (http://gp.intervarsity.org/why-go/four-reasons-go-global-program)

IVCF G 2018. “A Loving God Wouldn’t Send People to Hell.” Retrieved April 12, 2018. (https://evangelism.intervarsity.org/resource/loving-god-wouldnt-send-people-hell)

IVCF Press Room. 2014. “Re-creating Campus Ministry.” Retrieved: April 13, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/news/re-creating-campus-ministry)

IVCF Press Room. 2016. “InterVarsity Reiterates Theology of Human Sexuality.” Retrieved: April 12, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/news/intervarsity-reiterates-theology-human-sexuality)

IVCF Press Room. 2019. “Campus Access Issues.” Retrieved March 23, 2019. (https://intervarsity.org/campus-access-issues)

IVCF Task Force. 1999. “Enhancements to Inductive Bible Study.” Retrieved: April 18, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/sites/default/files/enhancements_to_ibs.pdf)

Jasper, James M. 2011. “Emotions and Social Movements: Twenty Years of Theory and Research.” *Annual Review of Sociology.* 37:285-303.

Jasper, James M. 2014. *Protest: A Cultural Introduction to Social Movements.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Johnson, Jazzy. 2015. “Remember Our Black and Brown Students.” Retrieved: April 12, 2018. (http://mem.intervarsity.org/mem/memblog/remember-our-black-and-brown-students)

Karagiannis, Emmanuel. 2009. “Hizballah as a Social Movement Organization: A Framing Approach.” *Mediterranean Politics,* 14(3):365-383.

Kemp, Jeff. 2014. “How men should respond to the NFL crisis.” Retrieved March 11, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/communities/families/how-men-should-respond-to-the-nfl-crisis.html)

Kim, Rebecca Y. 2004. “Second-Generation Korean American Evangelicals: Ethnic, Multiethnic, or White Campus Ministries?” *Sociology of Religion*. 65(1):19-34.

Kucinskas, Jaime. 2014. “The Unobtrusive Tactics of Religious Movements.” *Sociology of Religion.* 75(4):537-550.

Larson, Drew. 2015. “What Spiritual Warfare Is (and What It Definitely Isn’t.)” Retrieved March 1, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/blog/what-spiritual-warfare-and-what-it-definitely-isn%E2%80%99t)

Lichterman, Paul. 2002. “Seeing Structure Happen: Theory-Driven Participant Observation.” Pp 118-145 in *Methods of Social Research*, edited by Bert Klandermans and Suzanne Staggenborg. Minneapolis, MN. University of Minnesota Press.

Lin, Fen and Dingxin Zhao. 2016. “Social Movements as a Dialogic Process: Framing, Background Expectancies, and the Dynamics of the Anti-CNN Movement.” *Chinese Sociological Review.* 48(3):185-208.

Lin, Liz. 2016. "Goodbye, InterVarsity." Accessed February 18, 2019. (http://thesaltcollective.org/goodbye-intervarsity/)

Lin, Tom and Jim Lundgren. 2016. “Praying for God’s Justice.” Accessed: March 19, 2019. (https://intervarsity.org/news/praying-god%E2%80%99s-justice)

Long, Philip. 2018. “On the ground in Iraq.” Retrieved March 9, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/communities/ministries/gain/on-the-ground-in-iraq.html)

Lundgren, Jim. 2014. “Unity in Mission.” Retrieved: April 14, 2018. (https://collegiateministries.intervarsity.org/blog/unity-mission)

Ma, Miranda L. Y. 2017. “Affective Framing and Dramaturgical Actions in Social Movements.” *Journal of Communication Inquiry*. 41(1):5-21.

Macgillivray, Ian K. 2008. “Religion, Sexual Orientation, and School Policy: How the Christian Right Frames Its Arguments.” *Educational Studies.* 43:29-44.

MacLeod, A. Donald. 2007. *C. Stacey Woods and the Evangelical Rediscovery of the University.* Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press Academic.

Mayer, Brian, Phil Brown, and Rachel Morello-Forsch. “Labor-Environmental Coalition Formation: Framing and the Right to Know.” *Sociological Forum*. 25(4):746-768.

McAdam, Doug. 2012. *Putting Social Movements in their Place.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McAlister, Melani. 2017. “The Global Conscience of American Evangelicalism: Internationalism and Social Concern in the 1970s and Beyond.” *Journal of American Studies.* 51(4):1197-1220.

McCall, Ross. 2015. “Apple vs Android: What Would Jesus Do?” Retrieved March 3, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/blog/share-the-gospel/evangelism/apple-vs-android-what-would-jesus-do.html)

McCall, Ross. 2018. "Out of Work but Employed by God." Retrieved: March 3, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/communities/ministries/leaderimpact/testimonies/out-of-work-but-employed-by-god.html)

McCammon, Holly J. 2009. "Beyond Frame Resonance: The Argumentative Structure and Persuasive Capacity of Twentieth-Century U.S. Women's Jury-Rights Frames." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly.* 14(1) 45-64

McCammon, Holly J, Lyndi Hewitt, and Sandy Smith. 2010. "NO WEAPON SAVE ARGUMENT: Strategic Frame Amplification in the U.S. Woman Suffrage Movements." *The Sociological Quarterly* 45(3):529-556.

McCarty, Andrew. 2017. "Jesus Is Not Your Sports Buddy." Retrieved: March 4, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/blog/jesus-not-your-sports-buddy)

McEntire, K.J., M. Leiby, M. Krain. 2015. "Human Rights Organizations as Agents of Change: An Experimental Examination of Framing and Micromobilization." *American Political Science Review.* 109 (3) 407-426.

McReynolds, Joel. 2015. "What My Chronic Illness Has Taught Me." (https://intervarsity.org/blog/what-my-chronic-illness-has-taught-me)

Milan, Stefania. 2015 "From social movements to cloud protesting: the evolution of collective identity." *Information, Communication & Society.* 18(8):887-900.

Moore, Anthony. 2013. "Wisdom for Graduates: How to Find a Job." Retrieved: April 14, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/blog/wisdom-graduates-how-find-job)

Moore, Anthony. 2016. "Just Tell Me What I Need to Know: Finances After College." Accessed: April 18, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/blog/just-tell-me-what-i-need-know-finances-after-college)

Morse J. and C. Mitcham. 2002. "Exploring qualitatively derived concepts: Inductive-deductive methods." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods.* (4), Article 3.

Oliver, Pamela E. and Hank Johnston. 2000. "What a Good Idea! Frames and Ideologies in Social Movement Research." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly.* 5(1):37-54.

Mortensen, Torill Elvira. 2016. "Anger, Fear, and Games: The Long Event of #GamerGate." *Games and Culture.* 13(8):787-806.

Noakes, John. 2005. "Official Frames in Social Movement Theory: The FBI, HUAC, and the Communist Threat in Hollywood" pp89-112 in *Frames of Protest,* edited by Hank Johnston and John A. Noakes. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Noakes, John, and Hank Johnston. 2005. "Frames of Protest: A Roadmap to a Perspective" pp. 1-31 in *Frames of Protest,* edited by Hank Johnston and John A. Noakes. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.

One For Israel (OFI). 2018. "About." Retrieved: April 14, 2018. (https://www.oneforisrael.org/about-our-ministry/)

Peterson, Gretchen. 2006. "Cultural Theory and Emotions" Pp. 114-134 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions* edited by Jan E. Stets and Jonathan H. Turner. Berlin: Springer Science.

Pew Foundation. 2014. "Religious Landscape Study." Retrieved March 2, 2018 (http://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/)

Pitt, Richard. 2016. "Social Clubs or Social Movements? Can Church Plants Help Us Understand Other Non-profit Organizational Foundings?" *Conference Papers – American Sociological Association.* 1-29.

Polletta, Francesca, and James M. Jasper. 2001. "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 27: 283–305.

Pritchett, Bonnie. 2016. "InterVarsity Responds to Pro-LGBT Outcry." Retrieved: April 12. (https://world.wng.org/2016/10/intervarsity_responds_to_pro_lgbt_outcry)

Richardson, Michael. 2000. *Amazing Faith: One Man Who Spent His Life Taking God at His Word*. Colorado Springs, CO: Waterbrook Press.

Rieck, Lisa. 2017. "Your Life Doesn't Have to Look Like Everyone Else's." Retrieved: April 12, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/blog/your-life-doesn%E2%80%99t-have-look-everyone-else%E2%80%99s)

Rothman, Franklin Daniel and Pamela E. Oliver. 1999. "From Local to Global: The Anti-Dam Movement in Southern Brazil 1979-1992." *Mobilization* 4(1):41-57.

Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin. 1995. *Qualitative interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data.* Thousand Oaks, California. Sage Publishing.

Ryan, Charlotte, 2005. "Successful Collaboration: Movement Building in the Media Arena" Pp. 115-136 in *Rhyming Hope and History: Activists, Academics, and Social Movement Scholarship*, edited by David Croteau, William Hoynes, and Charlotte Ryan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Schnabel, Landon Paul. 2013. "When Fringe Goes Mainstream: A Sociohistorical Content Analysis of the Christian Coalition's Contract with the American Family and the Republican Party Platform." *Politics, Religion & Ideology.* 14(1):94-113.

Shellnutt, Kate. 2016. "InterVarsity Asks Staff to Choose a Stance on Sexuality." Retrieved April 14, 2018. (http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2016/october-web-only/intervarsity-asks-staff-to-choose-stance-on-sexuality.html)

Skinner, Tom. 1971. "US Racial Crisis and World Evangelism." Accessed February 18, 2019. (https://urbana.org/message/us-racial-crisis-and-world-evangelism)

Smith, Christian. 1998. *American Evangelicalism: Embattled and Thriving.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rockford, Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51:464-481.

Snow, David A. 2014. "The Emergence, Development, and Future of the Framing Perspective: 25 Years Since 'Frame Alignment.'" *Mobilization*. 19(1):23-45.

Snow, David A. 2004. "Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields." Pp. 380-412 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* edited by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, Hanspeter Kriesi.

Snow, David A., James A. Bany, Michelle Peria, and James E. Stobaugh. 2017. "A team field study of the appeal of megachurches: Identifying, framing, and solving personal issues." *Ethnography*. 11(1):165-188.

Somers, M.R. 1992. "Narrativity, Narrrative Identity, and Social Action: Rethinking English Working Class Formation." *Social Science History.*

Sommerfeldt, Erich. 2007. "Building a Social Movement through Public Relations: A Content Analysis of Christian Right Efforts to Foster Constituent Identification via E-Mail." *International Communication Association.* Washington DC.

Steensland, Brian, Eric L. Wright. 2014. "American Evangelicals and Conservative Politics: Past, Present, and Future." *Sociology Compass*. 8(5):705-717.

Steiner, Christopher. 2004. "College students exploring faith through debate." Retrieved: April 18, 2018. (http://spirituality.ucla.edu/docs/articles/chicagotribune_01_23_04.pdf)

Stewart, Jan. 2017. "Getting It Together: Avoiding Stress and Focusing on Christ." Retrieved: April 20, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/train-and-grow/life-and-relationships/work-and-rest/getting-it-together-avoiding-stress-and-focusing-on-christ.html)

Stracke, Janae. 2015. "Colorado Springs Shooter in Custody." Retrieved April 15, 2016 (http://www.cwfa.org/colorado-springs-shooter-in-custody/).

Strider, Brian. 2018. "Heaven and Hell." Retrieved April 11, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/train-and-grow/spiritual-growth/core-christian-beliefs/heaven-and-hell.html)

Sutton, Mathew Avery. 2014. *American Apocalypse: A History of Modern Evangelicalism*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.

Suh, Doowon, and Inn Hea Park. 2014. "Framing Dynamics of South Korean Women's Movements, 1970s-90s: Global Influences, State Responses, and Interorganizational Frameworks." *The Journal of Korean Studies (1979-).* 19(2):327-356.

Swartz, David R. 2012. *Moral Minority: The Evangelical Left in an Age of Conservatism.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Tavory, Iddo and Stefan Timmermans. 2009. "Two cases of ethnography: Grounded theory and the extended case method." *Ethnography*. 10(3):243-263.

Todd, Nathan R., Elizabeth A. McConnell, Charlynn A. Odahl-Ruan, and Jaclyn D. Houston-Kolnik. 2016. "Christian Campus-Ministry Groups at Public Universities and Opposition to Same-Sex Marriage." *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*. 9(4):412-422.

Tripp, Ashley. 2018. "Anxiety: Why I Can't Give You Simple Help." Retrieved March 11, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/blog/life-and-relationships/emotions/anxiety-help.html)

Trumpy, Alexa. 2008. "Woman vs Fetus: Frame Transformation and Intramovement Dynamics in The Pro-Life Movement." *Sociological Spectrum.* 34:163-184.

Tsarouhas, Dimitris. 2011. "Frame Extension, Trade Union Identities, and Wage Politics: Evidence from Sweden." *Social Politics*. 18(3):419-440.

Turner, John G. 2008. *Bill Bright & Campus Crusade for Christ: The Renewal of Evangelicalism in Postwar America*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

UICru. 2018. "CRU: Embracing the Gospel, Experiencing the Gospel Together, and Extending the Gospel to Others." Retrieved April 16, 2018. (http://www.uicru.com/)

Vampatella, John. 2012. "Justification: You Are Hereby Declared Innocent." Accessed: April 17, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/content/dam/cru/legacy/2012/02/Justification.pdf)

Vanderklippe, Nathan. 2014. "China broadens crackdown on foreign missionaries." Accessed March 10, 2019. (https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/china-broadens-crackdown-on-foreign-missionaries/article20187253/)

Van Dyke, Nella. 2003. "Crossing movement boundaries: Factors that facilitate coalition protest by American college students, 1930-1990. *Social Problems.* 50(2): 226-250.

Van Dyke, Nella, Sarah A. Soule, and Verta Taylor. 2005. "The Targets of Social Movements: Beyond a Focus on the State." Pp. 27-51 in *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts, and Change* edited Lisa Lentz. Emerald Group Publishing. Bingley, UK.

Vergo, Evangeline. 2018. "American Combat Veterans Need You." Retrieved March 1, 2018. (https://www.cru.org/us/en/communities/military/veterans-day-ptsd.html)

Vijay, Devi and Mukta Kulkarni. "Frame Changes in Social Movement." *Public Management Review*. 14(6): 747-770.

Voas, David and Mark Chaves. 2015. "Is the United States a Counterexample to the Secularization Thesis?" The American Journal of Sociology. 151(5): 1517-56.

Watson, Justin. 1997. *The Christian Coalition: Dreams of Restoration, Demands for Recognition.* St. Martin's Press. New York, NY.

Wilcox, Clyde. 1996. *Onward Christian Soldiers? The Religious Right in American Politics*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Williams, Rhys H. 2002. "From the 'Beloved Community' to 'Family Values': Relgious Language, Symbolic Repertoires, and Democratic Culture." Pp. 247-265 in *Social Movements: Identity, Culture, and the State*, edited by David S. Meyer, Nancy Whittier, Belinda Robnett. Oxford University Press. New York, NY.

Wilkinson, Lamar, Walter C Buboltz Jr., Toy R. Young. 2002. “Breathing Techniques to Promote Client Relaxation and Tension Reduction.” *Journal of Clinical Activities, Assignments & Handouts in Psychotherapy Practice.* 2(1):1-14.

Williams, Rhys H. 2011. “Politicized evangelicalism and secular elites: Creating a moral other.” Pp. 143-178 in *Evangelicals and Democracy in America*, edited by Brint, S. and J.R. Schroedel. Russel Sage Foundation. Chicago, IL.

Yates, Charlotte AB. 2010. “Understanding caring, organizing women: how framing a problem shapes union strategy.” *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research.* 16(3):399-410.

Ziegler, Katie. 2017. “We Cannot Be Silent.” Retrieved March 4, 2018. (https://intervarsity.org/news/we-cannot-be-silent)

Appendix A – Consent Form with IRB Approval

Interview Consent Form

My name is Matthew Peach, and I'm graduate student with the Sociology Department of the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign. I'm looking at the kinds of strategies that campus ministries use to try and change the world, and the lives of their members, and what members get out of joining. Please consider this information when deciding if you want to be interviewed my research project.

This project is voluntary. You can withdraw any time and there are no consequences for not taking part.

You must be at least 18 to participate.

Time: The interview is designed to take about an hour.

Benefits: The main benefit to taking part is that this is yet another opportunity to reflect on and articulate your spiritual journey and how it relates to other aspects of your life, not only for your own benefit, but for those who do not have your experience with Christian ministries like this one.

Risks: I don't anticipate any risks from taking part in this research.

Confidentiality: In general, I will not tell anyone any information about you. When this research is discussed or published, no one will know that you were in the study. However, laws and university rules might require us to disclose information about you. For example, if required by laws or University Policy, study information which identifies you and the consent form signed by you may be seen or copied by the following people or groups:

- The university committee and office that reviews and approves research studies, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Office for Protection of Research Subjects;
- University and state auditors, and Departments of the university responsible for oversight of research.

Use: This project is my dissertation, and will be the focus of my last years here. The material I gather could be used in any number of publications or presentations, but at no stage will you be identified.

Participation and Withdrawal: Your participation in this project is mostly limited to that hour-long interview. You can back out at any time without penalty or offense, and you can always contact me to talk more about anything to do with the interview. I can also show you a transcription of our interview once I've made it, and you can clarify or edit what you had to say. (It is not expected – some people are just worried about transcription, or think of the perfect way to say what they were trying to weeks later.)

Contact the researcher: You can reach me at peach3@illinois.edu, or 906-440-6445. I have contact cards if you want one. My advisor and the responsible primary advisor of this project, Dr. Anna Marshall, can be reached at amarshll@illinois.edu, or 217-333-1950.

For research-related questions, concerns, suggestions, or complaints that you don't want to address to me, you can contact the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at irb@illinois.edu, or 217-333-0405. (Suite 203, MC-419, 528 East Green Street, Champaign, Il, 61820.)

Agreement

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name (print): _____

Do you agree to be quoted directly (your name still won't be released)? _____

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Institutional Review Board

Approved: 10-28-16

IRB #: 17214

Appendix B – Interview Form

These are the six major questions that each semi-structured interview was built around.

1) How does being a Christian influence your daily life and social prospects? Do you ever feel like you have to dial it back (or alternatively wear your religion "loud and proud")?

2) How do you feel society relates to Christianity as a whole? How do you think your experience compares to that of the average Christian?

3) How do you benefit from membership in this group? Do you get opportunities to benefit the community by being a member? Do you ever feel like this community offers a refuge?

4) What do you hope to accomplish in the world that Cru/ICF can help you with? How are your efforts going?

5) Do you ever consider political involvement as a result of your membership here? What's going on in the world that you would want to change?

6) Do you ever disagree with your fellow members? Do you ever see yourself leaving over them?

These alternative questions were presented to people in leadership positions, such as the organizers of bible study groups, preachers, or even volunteers.

3) How did you find your way to this leadership position? Do you ever consider taking different roles in the organization?

4) When you are composing sermons/preparing events, what are your priorities? What are you hoping members take from them? Do you feel that members share your priorities?

5) Do you ever feel like you have to change your sermons/lessons to appeal more broadly? How do you feel about that?

6) How often do you have members leave? Do you think it's because they disagree with the organization, or are they just finding prospects elsewhere?